DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 201 IR 051 575

TITLE	Accreditation: A Way Ahead. "To Explore Procedures and Guidelines for Participation of a Variety of Associations in the Accreditation of Programs of Library and Information Science Education."
INSTITUTION	American Library Association, Chicago, Ill. Committee on Accreditation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Apr 86
NOTE	97p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); *Accrediting Agencies; Higher Education; Information Science; *Institutional Cooperation; *Library Education; Position Papers; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	American Library Association

ABSTRACT

To involve other professional and educational groups in the accreditation process of educational programs in the field of library and information science, for which the American Library Association (ALA) has current responsibility, this project developed specific recommendations with respect to the following needs: (1) to effect procedures and inter-organizational arrangements that will provide the basis for participation of multiple societies; (2) to establish guidelines by which the specific interests and concerns of each participating society will be recognized in the accreditation process; and (3) to revise as necessary the 1972 Standards for Accreditation, which provide the current basis for evaluation of programs. The report consists of eight chapters and four appendices. The first chapter is an executive summary, intended to serve not only as an introduction but as a free-standing document in itself, suitable for communication of the results to a large audience. The second chapter is a background paper describing the current accreditation process and the role of the ALA Committee on Accreditation. Chapters 3 and 4 are concerned with procedural issues related to organizing and financing the accreditation process in the context of the involvement of multiple professional societies. Chapters 5 through 8 are concerned with substantive issues involved in the evaluation of educational programs in the field, with emphasis on the interests of participating societies. The appendices contain the 1972 accreditation standards, a table showing accredited programs from 1925 to March 1986, a bibliography of relevant documents, and listings of participating societies and people who donated their energies to this project. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272201

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACCREDITATION: A WAY AHEAD

"To Explore Procedures and Guidelines for Participation of a Variety of Associations in the Accreditation of Programs of Library and Information Science Education."

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

APRIL 1986

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research & Improvement
Library Programs

IR051575

ACCREDITATION: A WAY AHEAD

"To Explore Procedures and Guidelines for Participation of a Variety of Associations in the Accreditation of Programs of Library and Information Science Education."

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

APRIL 1986

This project has been funded with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number 300-84-0134. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research & Improvement
Library Programs

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

Chapter 1	Executive Summary	1
Chapter 2	Background: The Accreditation Process and the ALA Committee on Accreditation	13
Chapter 3	Working Group 1: Organization of the Accreditation Process	20
Chapter 4	Working Group 2: Finance of the Accreditation Process	29
Chapter 5	Working Group 3: Guidelines for Program Goals and Objectives	38
Chapter 6	Working Group 4: Guidelines for Faculty	41
Chapter 7	Working Group 5: Guidelines for Curriculum	45
Chapter 8	Working Group 6: Guidelines for Society-Specific Objectives	57
Appendix A	Standards for Accreditation, 1972	68
Appendix B	Accredited Status of Library Schools	80
Appendix C	Bibliography	87
Appendix D	Participants: Associations, Steering Committee, Working Groups	91

CHAPTER 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Purpose of the Project

This project was undertaken by the American Library Association Committee on Accreditation on behalf of a variety of professional and educational groups concerned with the quality of educational programs leading to professional degrees in the field of library and information science. As the body formally recognized by the Council on Post-secondary Accreditation, the ALA has current responsibility for review and accreditation of such programs. However, there is need that the full range of concerns in the field, as represented by the several involved societies, be properly and adequately considered in the accreditation process. To date, except for the Canadian Library Association, for which there is an agreement that ALA will serve as its agent for accreditation, there is no formal participation of other interested societies. (Of course, there is informal participation, since the membership of ALA/COA as well as of site visit teams typically includes persons who have membership or affiliation with many interested societies.)

In order to involve other societies in the accreditation process for which ALA has current responsibility, at least two and possibly three things must be accomplished:

1) Procedures and inter-organizational arrangements must be effected that will provide the basis for participation of multiple societies. These must provide means to deal with financial responsibilities, administration, and policy determination.

2) Guidelines must be established by which the specific interests and concerns of each participating interested society will be recognized in the accreditation process.

3) The 1972 Standards for Accreditation, which provide the current basis for evaluation of programs, may need to be revised to reflect the interests of the participating interested societies, beyond the extent guidelines may be able to satisfy.

The purpose of the project presented in this Report was to develop specific recommendations with respect to these two or three needs, as a joint effort of the ALA and a wide range of other interested societies.

The Organization of the Report

The Report on the project consists of eight chapters and four appendices. The first chapter is this Executive Summary, which is intended to serve not only as an introduction to the Report but as a free-standing document in itself, suitable for communication of the results to a large audience. The second chapter is a background paper, describing the current accreditation process and the role of the ALA Committee on Accreditation. Chapters

three and four are concerned with procedural issues related to organization and financing of the accreditation process in the context of the involvement of multiple professional societies. Chapters five through eight are concerned with substantative issues involved in the evaluation of educational programs in the field, with emphasis on the interests of participating societies. The appendices provide details of the current accreditation standards, currently accredited programs, a bibliography of relevant documents, and details about the participating societies and the persons who donated their time and energies to this project.

The Major Recommendations

Based on the reports of the several Working Groups, the Steering Committee has one major recommendation, the first, and a number of subsidiary ones that in large measure merely amplify the major one:

Recommendation 1. The American Library Association should take immediate initiative to invite other interested professional societies to join it in the formation of an Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation.

Recommendation 2. The American Library Association should commit sufficient funds, estimated at $25,000, as an augmentation of the budget of the Committee on Accreditation, to cover the first year of operational expenses for the recommended Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation, with expectation that in subsequent years those costs would be shared equitably by the participating societies.

Recommendation 3. The Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation should be charged with the following responsibilities:

- To review the Final Report on this project, to evaluate the several recommendations embodied in the reports of the Working Groups incorporated in it, and to select those which should be implemented.
- To identify the continuing costs involved in the implementation of the selected recommendations, including the costs of the Inter-Association Advisory Committee itself.
- To identify the appropriate formula for sharing of the costs of the Inter-Association Advisory Committee among the participating societies in subsequent years.
- To identify potential sources for funding one-time costs involved in implementing other selected recommendations and to work with the Committee on Accreditation in developing and submitting proposals to those agencies.
- To cooperate with the Committee on Accreditation in the implementation of selected recommendations and advise the participating societies on the progress in implementation.
- To identify the appropriate formula for sharing of the continuing costs of accreditation among the participating societies.

Recommendation 4. It is recommended that, for the foreseeable future, accreditation should be focused on the first professional degree at the master's level.

Recommendation 5. It is recommended that the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation should work closely with each of the participating professional societies in the development of policy statements and appropriate documents that identify the educational requirements, for both general and society-specific objectives, in forms that will assist the process of evaluation of programs for accreditation.

Recommendation 6. It is recommended that the 1972 Standards for Accreditation and associated or related guidelines continue to serve as the basis for accreditation, but that the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation should establish, in cooperation with the Committee on Accreditation, a review process aimed at identifying the needs for additional guidelines and perhaps eventual replacement of the 1972 Standards.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT AND ITS ORIGINS

The general history of accreditation in the field of librarianship has been well documented in the literature, but Chapter 2 of this Report provides a brief review, together with a discussion of the current policies and procedures of the Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association. These have worked well for many decades, and for the past ten to fifteen years they have been guided by the 1972 Standards for Accreditation.

But within the past few years, a number of actions have been taken by several interested societies, by the U.S. Department of Education and other governmental agencies, and by various schools of library and information science that provide evidence of the need for a critical examination of the process of accreditation. Most recently, there have been five specific activities that are of immediate relevance:

- The Special Libraries Association and the American Society for Information Science have each proposed development of standards for evaluation of education in these fields.

- The report, published in the Journal of Medical Education, concerning the academic health science library as potential manager of health science information, identified educational needs that would represent major extensions of the requirements for professional practice in medical librarianship.

- The several "open meetings" held by the ALA/COA each year have revealed increasing concern for improved guidelines and procedures for accreditation.

- The U.S. Department of Education contracted for a study, which was conducted by King Research, Inc., of the future directions for library education.

- The Association for Library and Information Science Education held an invitational conference, under sponsorship of the H.W. Wilson Foundation, Inc., to consider and develop a new program of accreditation for library and information science education.

The concerns of the several professional societies with evaluation of educational programs are, of course, long-standing. The Medical Library Association and the American Association of Law Libraries, for example, have instituted various forms of certification. Several of the societies have established "educational committees" to consider their specific requirements. And the ALA Committee on Accreditation has continually strived to develop better criteria for evaluation, with specific concern about meeting the needs of the full range of professional requirements. Indeed, the 1972 Standards for Accreditation make explicit reference to "the major documents and policy statements of relevant professional organizations" as the basis for evaluation of the goals of programs being evaluated.

The King Research study of future directions for library education was explicitly concerned with the means for accommodating specialization within the curricula of programs for library and information science education. Of special concern were issues related to new kinds of specialties and new institutional contexts. It reflected the general concern of the U.S. Department of Education with these issues, and provided a frame of reference for them to consider funding of this project.

As the immediate predecessor of this project, the conference convened by the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) has particular significance. First, it demonstrated the general importance with which the issues in accreditation are viewed by the several societies. Second, it resulted in a hearty, unanimous endorsement of the concept of cooperation in accreditation among the several professional societies involved. Third, it explored several potential models which could be considered for such inter-society cooperation:

- o An umbrella organization, in which ALA would continue to assume the major responsibility for accreditation, with other societies participating in the process.
- o A separate organization to assume responsibility for the entire process of accreditation, acting on behalf of the societies represented by it.
- o A federation of library and information science societies, which, as equal partners, would plan, participate, support, and join together in evaluating the accreditation of programs.

The societies that participated in that ALISE meeting concluded that the goals should be that of federation, with recognition that it will take time, money, effort, and commitment to get there, and with recognition that intermediate stages will be required to do so.

The ALISE meeting served not only as the starting point for the project presented in this Report, but indeed it provided the forum within which, at its conclusion, it was announced that the continuation project would be undertaken, with funding by the U.S. Department of Education. The contract was formally signed; the project was initiated; and the societies represented at the ALISE meeting were asked to continue their participation.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT

The Participating Societies

The following interested societies were formally invited to participate in the project:

American Association of Law Libraries
American Library Association
American Society for Information Science
Association for Library and Information Science Education
Association of Research Libraries
Canadian Library Association
Medical Library Association
Special Libraries Association

Each of them indeed agreed to participate, although during the progress of the project the American Association of Law Libraries decided to withdraw, with the view that its needs were adequately met by current accreditation practices, supplemented by their own processes of certification.

Other relevant societies were informed of the project and encourged to participate:

Society of American Archivists
Association of Records Managers and Administrators
National Federation of Abstracting and Information Services

They did so primarily by observing the progress of the project, but with limited input to the discussion.

Each participating society nominated a person to serve as a member of the Steering Committee which coordinated the work on the project and was responsible for this Final Report. Each participating society appointed representatives on the set of Working Groups that were focused on specific sets of issues.

Management Structure

The project involved three levels of responsibility:

- o Project Management
- o The Steering Committee
- o The Working Groups

The office of the ALA Accreditation Officer was responsible for Project Management, including financial management, logistical arrangements, communications among the several other participating societies and persons, and arrangements for publication of the Final Report.

The Steering Committee was the focal point for the project. The membership included representatives from each of the participating societies and was headed by the Chairman of the ALA/COA. The effect is that ALA had two members of the Steering Committee, but that seems appropriate for at least three reasons:

- ALA is by far the largest of the participating interested societies, with membership greater than the total of all the others.

- ALA was representing not only itself, but a number of constituent interests, such as those of school librarians and college and research librarians.

- ALA is the recognized agency for accreditation in the field of library and information science.

The Steering Committee was responsible for policy guidance for the project, for the final recommendations, and for preparation and submission of this Final Report.

The Working Groups clearly were the central means for accomplishing the objectives of the project. There were six of them, focused on the following areas of concern:

- Working Group 1: Organization of the Accreditation Process
- Working Group 2: Finance of the Accreditation Process
- Working Group 3: Guidelines for Program Goals and Objectives
- Working Group 4: Guidelines for Faculty
- Working Group 5: Guidelines for Curriculum
- Working Group 6: Guidelines for Society-Specific Objectives

Each Working Group was chaired by a current member of one of the participating societies.

Time Schedule

The project was initiated with the signing of the contract with the U.S. Department of Education at the end of the ALISE-sponsored conference, in October 1984. During the ensuing two months the Steering Committee and Working Groups for the project were appointed, and the background paper (Chapter 2 of the Final Report) was prepared and distributed to the participants.

The Steering Committee and Working Groups first met during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 1985 where charges to the Working Groups were developed. From then until the ALA Annual Conference in June 1985, the Working Groups were identifying issues within their respective areas of concern, identifying alternatives, and preparing for discussion and presentation at the ALA Annual Conference. During that meeting, there were both Working Group sessions and plenary sessions for presentation of results to date.

Between June 1985 and January 1986, the Working Groups focused their attention on development of draft recommendations for consideration by the Steering Committee at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 1986. The result of those efforts was the preparation of a set of draft reports which then served as the basis for discussion during that meeting. Again, during that meeting, there were both Working Group sessions and plenary sessions for review of the draft reports and the recommendations to the Steering Committee contained in them.

The ensuing two months were devoted to the preparation of the Final Report, under the guidance of the Steering Committee, for submission to the U.S. Deparment of Education, in fulfillment of the contractual obligations of the project, and for distribution to the participating societies.

Throughout the project, the ALA Committee on Accreditation provided full and complete coverage of the objectives and progress of the project by presentation during the ALA/COA "open meetings" as part of the ALA meeting schedule. Beyond that, presentations were made during the ALISE conference held just before the ALA Midwinter Meeting of January 1986.

SUMMARY OF REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

Working Group 1: Organization of the Accreditation Process

The Working Group on the Organization of the Accreditation Process was charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Recommend an organizational model which will accommodate the participation of a number of library and information societies in the accreditation process.

2. Explore implications for procedural guidelines which will stem from the identification of an organizational model.

3. Recommend a mechanism for broadening the participation in the accreditation process by appropriate societies.

4. Prepare a report for the Steering Committee which describes the Working Group's methodology and explains its recommendations.

This Working Group in a very real sense was concerned with the most central issue of the project - the organizational mechanisms through which to involve several societies in the process of accreditation. The report is included as Chapter 3 of the Final Report on the project. It is indeed an excellent approach to a solution of the problems, and the overall recommendations from this Working Group were, as a result, heartily endorsed by the Steering Committee and form the main content of the final recommendations for the project.

To summarize, Working Group 1 recommended that other associations be invited to join with the American Library Association in governing the accreditation process. They recommend, as the essential preliminary, that an Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation should be formed to provide the formal means for initiating that involvement. That Advisory Committee would then take responsibility for planning and implementing the further steps. Specifically, it would provide the means by which potentially interested organizations could be invited to join in the planning; it would serve as the means for seeking subsidy for further stages; it would provide the means for communication with the Committee on Accreditation itself; it would provide the means for communication with the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation to assure compliance with guidelines in further stages; it would define the level and type of programs to be accredited; it would recommend the criteria for membership on the Committee on Accreditation; it would set the schedule for further stages in development; and it would evaluate whether those stages had progressed effectively. In other words, this recommended Advisory Committee would provide the means for maintaining the momentum generated by the ALISE initiative and by this project through a formally established, continuing agency.

Working Group 1 recommends that the Advisory Committee orient its future planning toward change of the organization of accreditation in three stages:

1. Addition of representatives from other information profession associations to the Committee on Accreditation, to augment the present membership, which is, except for two public members, chosen to represent the American Library Association.

2. Change in the governance of the Committee on Accreditation to an "umbrella-form" organization, with the American Library Association continuing as the responsible organization but serving as the agent for other participating societies.

3. Change to a federated structure, in which the several participating societies function as co-equal partners, at least with respect to policy formulation and accreditation decisions.

This staged approach to change provides the means for gradual transformation, with the possibility of pausing or even stopping at any stage when it appears that the objectives in involving the several societies have been adequately met. The judgments in that respect would be the responsibility of the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation, with the decisions, of course, then made by the participating societies.

The Working Group makes recommendation concerning the selection of members of the Committee on Accreditation and its size. It also discusses some specific issues related to accreditation procedures, such as selection of site visit team members and the kinds and levels of programs to be accredited. The report from the Working Group then concludes with a tentative time schedule for transition from the current status through the three stages recommended, as listed above.

Working Group 2: Finance of the Accreditation Process

The Working Group on Finance of the Accreditation Process was basically charged to develop an equitable financing model for the associations and institutions participating in the accreditation process. Within that broad charge, the following specific questions were to be explored:

1. Is there an equitable scheme for prorating costs among the participating groups and societies?

2. What specific factors - such as size, membership, organizational budget, number of educational programs sponsored, etc. - should be involved in cost sharing and cost distribution?

3. What costs should be borne by the participating societies and groups, and what costs should be borne by the institutions?

4. Is there a cost break-even point?

In addition, the group was charged to review the present COA budget and attempt to identify additional costs which would result from adding a number of societies and groups;

to identify possible sources of start-up funding, to estimate the amount needed, and for how long it should be available; estimate the ongoing costs to the constituent groups and societies after start-up funding is withdrawn.

This Working Group was concerned with perhaps the most difficult and sensitive of the issues involved in multi-society cooperation: Who is going to pay for it, and how much? Without question, while the professional concerns of the several societies may lead them to an interest in accreditation, their decisions concerning participation are likely to be governed by the budgetary implications. While the Working Group does not make explicit recommendations concerning the mechanism for funding, it does provide substantive data of great value in subsequent steps in evaluation by the proposed Advisory Comittee.

Specifically, the Working Group report, presented as Chapter 4 of the Final Report on the project, provides an analysis of current costs of accreditation. The report estimates total costs per annum of over $1,000,000 for just the programs currently covered by accreditation. Over half of that cost is borne by the schools being accredited, the great bulk of it in the time and effort involved in preparing self-studies and in the conduct of site visits. The remaining costs, with which the societies would be primarily concerned, total about $500,000 - half of it the cost of volunteer service on the Committee on Accreditation and on site visit teams. The core expenses - the direct and indirect costs of the Committee on Accreditation itself - are estimated at about $250,000. It is that final figure of $250,000 that would represent the financial commitment involved in participation in the process of accreditation. Of course, it is recognized that these estimates reflect the current situation and that participation of multiple societies in an expanded program will doubtless involve increased costs, which the Working Group report arbitrarily estimates at perhaps 10%.

The Working Group report presents alternative formulas for allocation of those costs, based on the experience of other cooperative arrangements. It concludes with the recommendation that the Inter-Association Advisory Committee determine, as a primary responsibility, what the funding needs will be. In fact, first among those would be the costs of the Advisory Committee itself, which the Working Group report estimates at $25,000 for the first year of operations.

In light of the estimates of costs to the institutions being accredited, the Working Group report concludes with the recommendation that every effort be made, by whatever may be the accrediting agency, to reduce the fiscal burden on those institutions.

Working Group 3: Guidelines for Program Goals and Objectives

The Working Group on Guidelines for Program Goals and Objectives was charged with the following tasks:

1. Clarify the role of goals and objectives in the accreditation process. In particular, should goals be defined by the program being accredited or by the larger information professions?

2. Clarify the role of goals and objectives in relation to curriculum.

3. Consider how general goals and objectives relate to society-specific goals and objectives (i.e., those defined by the information professions).

4. Clarify the desired level of goals and objectives - should they be very general and lofty or should they be very specific?

This Working Group drew heavily upon the statements regarding goals and objectives embodied in the 1972 Standards for Accreditation in dealing with its charges, finding them of continuing value and appropriate to involvement of multiple societies. Perhaps the most important implicit recommendation in the report of this Working Group, presented as Chapter 5 of the Final Report on the project, is that the participating societies themselves need to develop the "major documents and policy statements," to which the 1972 Standards refer as the basis for evaluating program goals and objectives. For the accrediting body to assist the schools and to apply such policy statements in accreditation decisions, the documents identifying them must exist.

Working Group 4: Guidelines for Faculty

The Working Group on Guidelines for Faculty was charged as follows:

1. Should there be guidelines of faculty competencies specific to society interests? If so, what?

2. Should there be guidelines relating to the size (i.e., number) of faculty? If so, what?

3. Should there be guidelines concerning general qualifications of faculty with respect to, for example, teaching competency; service to community, university and profession; research productivity and research competency?

4. Should there be guidelines with respect to experience - academic, practice, counselling, other?

5. Should there be guidelines for professional development of faculty - need for retraining, updating, etc.?

This Working Group placed special emphasis on the institutional prerogatives and responsibilities. The view expressed is that the institution is "primarily responsible for establishing standards for faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure" and for operational policies relating to work load, leaves, and compensation.

The report of this Working Group, presented as Chapter 6 of the Final Report on the project, does discuss some general qualifications, drawing heavily upon the 1972 Standards for Accreditation. It discusses academic qualification, scholarship, experience, professional activity, community service, subject expertise, and teaching effectiveness as areas of essential competency whatever may be the assigned specializations. It then discusses the need for more specialized competencies related to specializations, concluding that participating societies need to suggest means for measuring effectiveness in their scope of interest.

Working Group 5: Guidelines for Curriculum

The Working Group on Guidelines for Curriculum was charged as follows:

1. What should be the general approach to curricular issues, on a continuum which runs from "sidestepping curricular definitions" to "a series of definitions, course descriptions, etc."?

2. What should be the approach to:

   - o Definition of "core curriculum/competencies", if any?
   - o Society-specific specializations?
   - o Specializations outside information science/librarianship?
   - o Quality determination and/or validation?
   - o Joint degree programs?
   - o Definition of the level at which the first degree is granted?

3. Categorize the spectrum of the information disciplines and define what our accreditation process covers. In particular, should it cover information management in other schools?

The report of this Working Group is presented in Chapter 7 of the Final Report on the project. It provides a most provocative and thorough analysis of the scope of the field, the content of academic programs, the nature and role of the "core curriculum," and the means for measuring quality. The analysis of the core knowledge requirements identifies three main categories of content which are worth repeating here:

A. knowledge areas, encompassing philosophy and background, environmental and contextual knowledge, and management knowledge.

B. tool areas, encompassing quantitative and analytical tools (such as statistics, research methods, systems analysis) and bibliographic and organizational tools (the traditional "core": cataloging and classification, reference, collection development, data and file structure, etc.).

C. skill requirements, encompassing communication skills, technological skills, and interpersonal skills.

The Working Group report includes a discussion of the problems involved in dealing with multiple specializations within a unified accreditation program. Of special concern in this respect is how to deal with undergraduate as well as graduate programs. It discusses three options: accreditation of programs, accreditation of specialties, and accreditation of schools. It recommends that these alternatives continue to be explored.

Working Group 6: Guidelines for Society-Specific Objectives

The Working Group on Guidelines for Society-Specific Objectives was charged as follows:

1. What are the unique needs of each society? In what areas do societies have goals specific and separate from the communal goals of the federation?

2. Who will decide what society goals are adopted by the profession?

3. How should these objectives be incorporated into the accreditation process?

4. Who will decide whether a program is meeting these objectives?

5. If a school offered itself for accreditation in an area of emphasis or concentration, what action, if any will be taken to distinguish a general program accreditation from one for stated areas of emphasis? By what criteria are schools offering specializations accredited?

This final Working Group provided the means by which particular concerns of the participating societies would be discussed, without the constraints of identified categories, whether organizational or substantive. As the report, presented as Chapter 8 of the Final Report on the project, says, some of the societies - the Society of American Archivists and the American Society for Information Science, in particular - pointed out that degrees other than the MLS are appropriate means for entry to the field of their concern. Others were concerned about the relationship of accreditation to continuing education and their societal responsibilities in that respect. Of general concern was the means for developing and evaluating areas of emphasis within curricula and programs. The report concludes with reviews of the statements from various professional societies of their expectations.

In bringing together those policy statements, from at least some of the participating professional societies, this Working Group has again highlighted the importance of such documents to the accreditation process. As the 1972 Standards state, the goals of programs should be judged in the context of the "major documents and policy statements" of the professional societies. If nothing else, it is hoped that this project has alerted all of the societies involved to the necessity of creating and reviewing their own statements of policy in this respect.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Given the fact that the several Working Groups arrived at the respective reports quite independently, there is a remarkable degree of consistency among them. In particular, the need for an Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation is emphasized in several of them. The need for the participating societies to develop policy statements that document their requirements for educational specialization is emphasized in several of them. The essential endorsement of the 1972 Standards for Accreditation as still a workable basis for accreditation decisions is evident throughout the reports of the four Working Groups concerned with substantive aspects.

There certainly are a few inconsistencies, both within the reports of individual Working Groups and among them. They appear to be minor and simply represent the nature of the process by which the work on this project was carried out.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND: THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS AND THE ALA COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

I. ACCREDITATION OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE EDUCATION

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) is the nongovernmental, voluntary association of accrediting bodies that serves as the means for coordinating accrediting activities and dealing with problems in accreditation. Its objectives are: (1) to assure a degree of consistency in accreditation, (2) to avoid unnecessary duplication of accrediting activities or agencies, and (3) to provide means for discussion of needs and problems in accreditation.

The American Library Association (ALA) is the organization officially recognized by COPA for accrediting first professional degree programs in the field of library and information science. ALA carries out its responsibilities in accreditation through its Committee on Accreditation (COA). The COA is also listed by the U.S. Secretary of Education as a nationally recognized accrediting agency and has been determined to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by programs in the field for which it is responsible.

This paper is intended to provide background on the accreditation of library and information science education as currently conducted by the COA. It is based on and summarizes a number of policy documents, issued over the years by the COA. These documents and reports will be found listed in the bibliography appended to this report.

II. HISTORY

The ALA first undertook responsibility for accreditation in its field in 1924 with the creation of its Board of Education for Librarianship. In 1956 that was replaced by the COA, which was charged with responsibility for the development and formulation of standards of education for librarianship (for approval of the ALA Council) and for the execution of the ALA accreditation program.

In its first years, the COA functioned under Standards for Accreditation that had been formulated and approved in 1951. However, after several years of review, new Standards for Accreditation were formulated and adopted by the ALA Council on 27 June 1972. With only minor changes those have been the basis for accreditation decisions since then. A copy of the 1972 Standards for Accreditation and a summary of the accredited status of library education programs since the inception of the ALA accreditation process are included with this report as Appendixes A and B respectively.

III. THE COA MEMBERSHIP

The COA consists of twelve members, appointed by the ALA Executive Board for two-year terms, staggered so as to assure continual turnover. Members may be reappointed for

one additional consecutive term. In appointments, conscious effort is made to assure that the COA as a whole has balanced representation of the various aspects of library and information science, without directly representing any organized group. In addition, two of the twelve members, conforming to COPA requirements, are not librarians or information scientists or even affiliated with the field; they are appointed as representatives of the public interest.

The COA members other than the "public members" are usually equally divided between practicing professionals and educators in the field. The intent is to assure that both the needs of the profession and the realities of the educational process are recognized in accreditation.

The COA is supported by an administrative secretariat consisting of the Accreditation Officer of the COA and the staff of the accreditation unit. This provides both continuity in management of the accreditation process and the necessary support services.

IV. PURPOSES OF ACCREDITING

It is important to identify the purposes of accrediting, as they are understood by the COA. First, the COA accredits only first professional degree programs; thus, it does not accredit undergraduate programs, certificate programs, doctoral programs, or continuing education programs. Second, the COA accredits programs, not schools or institutions; as a result, the COA is careful in the phrasing it uses, referring to programs at all times. Third, the COA accredits programs rather than certifying individuals; thus, there is no evaluation of individual graduates of programs made or implied by the accreditation of those programs, except to the extent that such evaluation may be considered in the evaluation of the program.

As a result, the purpose of accreditation, as seen by the COA, is to assure that programs providing preparation for the first professional degree meet the objectives of the profession, of the students, and of the society, at least to the extent that those objectives are identified in the Standards for Accreditation and can be evaluated through an appropriate process.

V. THE STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITATION

As stated above, ALA has assigned responsibility to the COA for both the development of standards and the process of accreditation, subject to review and approval by the ALA Council. The 1972 Standards for Accreditation, with minor changes, have guided the COA since 1972. However, those Standards are under continual review by the COA at its regular and special meetings, particularly in connection with the review of reports of visiting teams and in the reviews of annual reports from the schools with accredited programs. Furthermore, the Standards are under constant scrutiny by the profession itself. At open sessions during the ALA meetings, the COA encourages the profession to comment on the Standards and the process of accreditation, toward the aim of identifying necessary changes.

In summary, though, the Standards cover six general areas in which each program must be evaluated: (1) program goals and objectives, (2) curriculum, (3) faculty, (4) students,

(5) governance, administration and financial support, and (6) physical resources and facilities. It is important to note that while each of these six general areas is to be considered in the evaluation, the accreditation decision is made in terms of the program as a whole and not in terms of any single area.

The Standards are designed to emphasize qualitative rather than quantitative criteria. They identify what a program should demonstrate to be consistent with the needs of the profession of library and information science. They are intended to encourage schools to experiment in professional education while maintaining an appropriate level of excellence in covering the study of principles and procedures common to all types of library and information science professional work.

The Standards emphasize that programs should be judged in the context of their own defined goals and objectives, provided that the goals and objectives are consistent with the general principles of the field and of education for library and information science.

The Standards are supplemented by a set of published guideline statements which assist the COA, the visiting teams, and the schools in the interpretation of the Standards. However, the guidelines serve as aids, not as substitutes for the Standards themselves.

VI. THE PROCESS OF ACCREDITATION

The COA follows a well-defined series of steps in accreditation:

- o Determining eligibility
- o Evaluating applications for accreditation
- o Evaluation by a visiting team
- o Action regarding accreditation
- o Continuing accreditation and annual reporting

Determining Eligibility

While the COA and the Accreditation Officer are ready and willing to provide information and advice at any time, a program is not eligible for consideration for accreditation until it has been in operation long enough for students to have graduated from it. Furthermore, consideration by the COA is contingent upon the accreditation of the parent institution by the appropriate regional accrediting agency.

Evaluating Applications for Accreditation

A school seeking initial accreditation or continuing accreditation of its program under the Standards must file with the Accreditation Officer a letter of intent to request a site visit. This letter must be filed at least six months prior to the start of the twelve-month period during which the school desires a visit. The Accreditation Officer supplies the school with copies of the following relevant materials:

- o Standards for Accreditation, 1972

- Manual of Procedures for Evaluation Visits Under Standards for Accreditation, 1972

- Self-Study: A Guide to the Process and to the Preparation of a Report for the Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association (Under Standards for Accreditation, 1972)

The school's application consists of a self-study report, including current catalogs or brochures, accompanied by a letter from the chief executive officer of the institution requesting an evaluation visit. After receipt of the self-study report, it is evaluated by the COA during the subsequent Midwinter Meeting or Annual Conference of the ALA, and decision is made regarding the readiness of the program for an evaluation visit.

In the case of schools requesting initial accreditation, the decision is based on the adequacy of the self-study report as a working document and on an assessment, based on the self-study report, of the readiness of the program for a site visit. If the assessment is negative, the COA must state clearly, in a letter to the chief executive officer of the institution and to the school, the basis for the negative decision. If the assessment is inconclusive, the COA will hold the application in abeyance, stating its concerns to the institution; if the institution responds to the concerns, the COA then reevaluates its decision. If the assessment is positive, a site visit will be scheduled at a mutually agreeable time.

Evaluation by a Visiting Team

A site visit is the means for obtaining an understanding of those aspects of a school's program that cannot be fairly judged from documentation alone. During the site visit, the team is in the role of evaluator, not inspector, and evaluates matters that bear directly upon the quality of the educational program to be accredited.

The visiting team normally consists of not less than three persons, one of them a member or former member of the COA, with one member designated as chair. Names of persons to serve on a visiting team are recommended by the COA, taking into account factors such as balance of practitioners and educators, the special fields emphasized in the school's curriculum, the geographical area when that seems pertinent, and economy of time and expense in travel. The recommended names are submitted to the executive officer of the school, to give an opportunity for comments and to avoid appointments that would be unacceptable to the school. The COA then, based on the school's comments and its own assessment, formally appoints a team.

As soon as the team has been established, the school's self-study report and the COA comments on the self-study report are sent to each team member. Copies of other relevant materials (the Standards, forms for team logs, prescribed format for the team report, guideline statements, etc.) are also sent to the team members at that time.

The chair of the team assigns responsibilities to each member for onsite examination of specific areas of the Standards. Thus, each member of the team is expected to provide

an evaluation of the particular areas assigned as well as participating in discussion and evaluation of other aspects of the visit; furthermore, each member of the team is responsible for approval of all parts of the team report before it is submitted to the COA and to the school.

The site visit itself normally begins on a Sunday evening and continues until the following Thursday noon. The team meets on Monday with the school's executive officer, confirms schedules, and then makes a presentation to the school as a whole during which the accreditation process is described and questions concerning it can be answered. During the visit, in accordance with the Manual of Procedures, activities of the team include conferences with members of the faculty, informal meetings with students, visits to classes, observation of the physical facilities and resources, meetings with graduates and employers of graduates, and meetings with the major administrative officers of the institution. Records are examined relating to the program, the instruction, the admission and progress of students, and the evaluation of faculty.

The site visit concludes with the drafting of a report which will consist of three major areas: a Factual Section, an Evaluative Section, and a set of Recommendations for the improvement of the program. A final recommendation is made by the team to the COA concerning accreditation action.

The final version of the Factual Section serves as the basis for the other sections of the team report. That is, the Evaluative Section must be based on the Factual Section; the Recommendations must all be substantiated by the Factual Section and the related portions of the Evaluative Section. And of course, all parts of the site visit report must be justified on the basis of the Standards. Therefore, a draft of the Factual section is mailed to the school within ten days of the site visit for verification and correction. The response from the school may lead to correction of the Factual Section, if necessary. The Evaluative Section and the Recommendations are then completed. The final site visit report as a whole is sent to the COA, which forwards a copy of all but the final recommendation (concerning accreditation action) to the school. The school has the opportunity to respond to it in writing or orally.

Action Regarding Accreditation

The COA is responsible for the final decision concerning accreditation. In arriving at that decision, it considers carefully the recommendation of the site visiting team as well as the substance of the team's site visit report. It reviews that report thoroughly and meets with the site visit team for discussion of it, in order to assure that the evaluations and recommendations are well grounded in the Standards. Based on this review and discussion, the COA makes its decision concerning accreditation, and notice of the decision is sent immediately by the Accreditation Officer to the chief executive officer of the institution and executive officer of the school. The COA then prepares its report to the school. The final COA report usually is virtually identical with that of the site visit team, though it may differ substantially. It is submitted shortly thereafter, again to the institution and the school, with the suggestion that it be made available to the full-time members of the school's faculty and to the appropriate other administrative officers of the institution.

The entire process, including the site visit, the team's report, and the COA report is treated as confidential by the COA and the site visit team members. However, the school is encouraged to make known the content of the final report, to the extent that it wishes to.

The COA may vote to take any one of the following actions:

- o Accredit or continue to accredit. In this case, the recommendations included in the final COA report to the school must be reported upon in subsequent yearly reports to the COA.

- o Conditionally accredit. In this case, the recommendations included in the final COA report become the conditions that must be met, within a stated period of time, in order to have conditional status removed.

- o Not accredit or withdraw accredited status.

The COA releases the information on an accreditation action through its publication Graduate Library Education Programs Accredited by the American Library Association, to the ALA Executive Board, to the library press, to appropriate organizations in the field of library education, to COPA, to the U.S. Department of Education, and to the appropriate regional accrediting associations. This information on accreditation actions is released only after expiration of the time in which an appeal of a COA decision may be made. In the case of a program entering an appeal, the accredited status of the program remains the same until an appeal is adjudicated.

Continuing Accreditation and Annual Reporting

When a program is granted initial accreditation, the accreditation is retroactive to the academic year preceding the one in which the evaluation visit is made. Periodic visits for reaccreditation are then scheduled every seventh year following the date of the first accreditation.

Between visits, schools with accredited or conditionally accredited programs must submit annual reports to the COA. These reports build upon the self-study report and provide means for the COA to monitor the progress of the program. In particular, the reports are required to respond to the recommendations included in the COA report on accreditation. If an annual report from a school raises concern in the COA about its accreditation status, the COA may request additional information or even an early site visit.

Based on the annual report, the COA takes one of three actions:

- o Accepts the annual report and continues the program's accredited status.

- o Defers action on the report until additional information is supplied.

- o Declines to accept the report and arranges to schedule a site visit as early as possible.

VII. APPEAL

Any institution which is not granted full accreditation of its program by the COA may appeal the COA decision to the ALA Executive Board within six weeks after receipt of the full report of the COA decision. The ALA Executive Board will appoint a Select Committee of no fewer than five qualified persons to consider the appeal. Upon receipt of the report of the Select Committee, the ALA Executive Board will either (1) affirm the decision of the COA, or (2) set aside the decision of the COA and remand the case back to the COA with appropriate instruction for further proceedings and reconsideration.

CHAPTER 3

WORKING GROUP 1: ORGANIZATION OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUP

Background information for the Working Group on Organization of the Accreditation Process: At the H.W. Wilson Foundation, Inc. sponsored ALISE meeting in Chicago, several models for accreditation were explored:

- o An umbrella organization in which ALA would continue to assume major responsibility for accreditation with other organizations participating in the process.
- o A separate organization to assume responsibility for accreditation, e.g., AAMC for accreditation of medical schools.
- o Federation of library and information societies which would plan, participate, support, and evaluate the accreditation of programs.

The Working Group on the Organization of the Accreditation Process has the following responsibilities:

1. Recommend an organizational model which will accommodate the participation of a number of library and information societies in the accreditation process.
2. Explore implications for procedural guidelines which stem from the identification of an organizational model.
3. Recommend a mechanism for broadening the participation in the accreditation process by appropriate societies.
4. Prepare a report for the Steering Committee which describes the Working Group's methodology and explains its recommendations.

I. BACKGROUND

The Working Group on Organization met at the American Library Association conferences in January 1985, July 1985 and January 1986 to discuss features that should be present in a new accreditation structure if information societies other than ALA are to be invited to join the accreditation process. Much of the communication for preparation of this report has been by mail. The recommendations and comments which follow are based on ideas found in literature, discussions with interested parties outside the Working Group, and suggestions from Working Group members.

The Working Group feels that it is important to involve a greater number of persons and allow time for further study before a commitment is made to radical change of the present

accreditation structure. Before any changes are made on the basis of the Working Group recommendations, the affected associations must be informed of the proposed changes, and given ample time to inform their memberships, seek feedback, and take official positions. If possible, before any major change, there should be public consensus that each applied change is desirable and assurance that adequate resources will be available for the changed system.

Definitions which will help the reader understand the commentary:

The Board: The highest decision-making group in the accreditation process; the unit that makes the final decision to accredit or not to accredit.

Federation: A governing body whose members represent different organizations, and whose members each have the same amount of decision-making power and responsibility; it is possible for an organization to have more than one representative in a federation, and thus have more de facto decision-making power than others. The federation cannot dictate internal policy to member organizations, which may withdraw from the federation at any time.

Umbrella Organization: A variation on a federation in which one participating organization has more mandated decision-making power than other participating organizations.

Program: The course offerings of a school or self-standing department of a school.

Specialization: A subset of a program that is proclaimed by a school to educate persons to function as specialists.

Information Professions: Professions based on the organization, storage and retrieval of information, whose members come from named-degree education programs at the graduate level; specializations in departments such as computer science or management information science could be included in the category as easily as those in library science.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Professions to be Accredited

The Working Group is agreed that accreditation is needed in information profession education programs related to librarianship, and that the ALA Committee on Accreditation or a successor to COA with representation from other information profession associations should be the organization responsible both for continuing to accredit librarianship education programs and for accrediting other information profession education programs.

B. Governance

As plans are made to accredit education programs in information professions other than librarianship, other associations that represent those professions should be invited to join

ALA in governing the accreditation process. The Working Group on Organization recommends that plans be made to change the organization of COA in three stages:

1. Addition of representatives from other information profession associations to COA.

2. A change in governance of COA to umbrella-form organization, with ALA continuing to have more responsibility and authority than other participating organizations.

3. Federation, the goal of the evolutionary process.

However, before other action can occur an Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation must be formed.

The benefits that will result from evolution, rather than abrupt change to federation include:

1. The changes will be easier to accomplish and less traumatic to the accreditation process. There will be time to deal with problems that result from change a few at a time.

2. It should be easier to reach consensus on the desirability of each small change than on one major set of changes.

3. Gradually increasing the financial burden on new organizations participating in the process should make their new financial burden easier to manage.

4. The point at which the financial burden to participating organizations becomes unacceptable will be easier to identify as it is increased gradually. That could determine a practical stopping point in the evolution toward federation that would permit a maximum of participation with participating organizations paying their way.

5. Associations will not be presented with a forbiddingly expensive proposition and forced to make an all-or-none decision.

6. The experience and knowledge of the ALA staff will be available.

7. There will continue to be a point of authority and responsibility as changes are implemented.

8. By making the changes in steps, the need to have a new program operating for two years for Council on Postsecondary Accreditation recognition may be obviated.

9. As procedures are changed a few at a time, their effectiveness may be evaluated, and decisions may be made to stop change at an optimum point on the spectrum.

10. If the accreditation structure were changed abruptly to a federation dependent on support from participants, and the federation proved unsatisfactory, there would be no fallback position when the participants withdrew.

The object of adding Board members from a variety of associations that represent information professions is to provide expertise across the spectrum of information professions. Board members will be responsible first to the Board and accreditation process, and second to the organizations they represent. If a participating association attempts to institute rules in conflict with Board rules, the Board will follow its own rules.

ALA should continue to play a major role in the process. When the third stage of change, federation, is reached, ideally no association's representatives should be permitted a voting majority on the Board. (NB: The wording of the regulation controlling Board membership should indicate that each member of the Board will function as the representative of the organization that appointed him or her to the Board, regardless of the member's other professional association memberships.)

C. Board Member Selection

Each Board member should be appointed by the organization the member represents; whether the organization elects to make the appointment the responsibility of its president, executive director, executive council, a standing committee, or by some other means, should be up to the organization.

Care should be taken to maintain balance in the professional orientation of the new Board. When it is time for a turnover in Board membership, the existing Board or its administrative office should provide each participating association with guidelines as to the characteristics the association's next representatives should possess (e.g., educator or practitioner, administrator or operations person).

Some Board members should continue to be lay persons.

D. Size of Board

The optimum number of Board members remains to be determined. Some members of the Working Group feel that the number should be increased to facilitate substantially more involvement by associations other than ALA. Others fear that appointing too many Board members would lead to inability to make decisions and unnecessary expense. An increase from 12 to 15 may be a reasonable compromise, if it proves necessary. It may be possible to rotate Board membership among participating associations as the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation does. CAHEA has 23 participating organizations, and rotates its 14 Board memberships among them.

The number of Board members from a given association should be determined by formula. Factors to be included in the formula may include:

1. The number of members in each organization.

2. The number of curricula and programs to be considered for accreditation that fall in each association's domain.

3. A threshold amount of financial support for any participation.

E. Visiting Team Member Selection

The Board should appoint visiting team members according to a set of selection rules. Membership of a visiting team should be aligned with the proclaimed specializations of each institution being visited. As with the Board, care should be taken that visiting teams have a balance of educators and practitioners.

F. Team Visits

Team visits should be continued. The new Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation should consider other options for evaluating programs such as those experiments being conducted by the Council on Rehabilitation Education, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and others. If successful, these methods could make many site visits unnecessary.

G. Programs and Specializations

The accrediting organization should continue to accredit entire programs. In addition, it should consider specializations for accreditation when those specializations:

1. Are not part of a program the accrediting organization has already approved for accreditation, and

2. Result in graduates receiving degrees that contain the name of the specialization.

H. Education Levels

The Board should consider master's degree, "the first professional degree," programs and specializations for accreditation. Other degree programs (undergraduate, doctoral) should be considered when they affect the strength of the master's program.

Undergraduate programs should not be accredited by the Board, at the present time.

As is customary in higher education Ph.D. programs will not be accredited by the Board.

III. PROPOSED CALENDAR OF EVENTS

The schedule of events is intended to provide the Working Groups and Steering Committee with a rough checklist of possible activity. It has not been planned carefully, or even discussed in much detail. However, before other action can occur an Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation must be formed.

A. STAGE ONE: ALTERATIONS IN COA

1986

- Recommendations of Steering Committee are made

- Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation is formed to replace the Steering Committee. The Chair of COA is invited to serve as an ex officio member. The Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation will:

  * Assure that all potentially interested associations and institutions are invited to join in planning

  * Seek subsidy for initial participation of new associations in COA activity

  * Maintain full communication with the Office of Postsecondary Education and COPA to assure that the plans do not violate their guidelines

  * Define clearly the levels and types of programs to be accredited

  * Determine criteria for COA membership

  * Set the schedule of increasing financial responsibility for participating associations

  * Decide when changes along a continuum are sufficient, and movement to a new stage of development should not occur

- ALA evaluates and initiates suggested changes in COA for the first stage of reorganization:

  * Increased membership of COA

  * Reduced ALA representation on COA

  * Funding from other assocations to cover only part of added expenses

- Any association willing to pay its representative's way to the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation is invited to send a representative. No association is permitted a majority on the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation. Each association pays the expenses of its representative(s)

- Each association designates an administrative official as liaison

- Each association submits documents to the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation to aid in planning:

  * Membership lists
  * Financial reports
  * Lists of academic programs where accreditation is deemed desirable

- Each association determines:

  * Who will represent it for policy decisions

    - Executive officer
    - Board of directors
    - A new standing committee
    - Some other unit

  * What accreditation policies are desirable, acceptable, and unacceptable

  * What resources it will volunteer, and what limits it will place on participation

    - Personnel
    - Funds

    (The Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation should provide an indication of the amount needed to each association for consideration - as detailed as possible, for each planning stage.)

1987

- The Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation continues working. It commences evaluation of completed changes in COA

- First associations make commitment to participate in COA activity

- Levels and types of programs to be accredited are redefined in light of association commitments

- Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation identifies need for new standards and procedures, and calls for appropriate work from participating associations

- ALA changes bylaws and procedures documentation as needed:

  * To permit representatives of other associations to serve on COA, and to change the size of COA

  * To commit ALA's President to comply with guidelines from the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation

- New staff members are sought for the COA administrative office

- The first representatives from other associations are appointed to COA. Additions are made at the appropriate time in the appointment cycle. Appointments are according to new guidelines agreed to by ALA and the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation

- ALA's President continues to appoint lay representatives

- COA accreditation reports continue to go to the affected school. Information with respect to COA decisions goes first to the school, then to participating associations, and is published later

- Appeals are handled as now

1988

- New staff members, both temporary and permanent, are in place at the administrative office

- ALA still pays for administrative office expenses including:

  * Training visiting team members
  * Training COA staff
  * Data collection
  * Annual report reviews
  * Publications
  * Self-study reviews
  * Appeals

- Associations are paying their representatives' way to COA meetings

- The number of ALA representatives on the COA is reduced as needed to permit other associations to send members and maintain a maximum of 15 COA members

- Approval of changes in system is sought from associations

- Approval of changes in system is sought from COPA and USDE

- Appeals are handled as now

B. STAGE TWO: UMBRELLA STRUCTURE

1989 or later, timing uncertain

- The Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation continues working

- Participating associations formally commit themselves to participation, with changes in bylaws and written procedures

- COA continues to be responsible to ALA

- Procedures for ad hoc committees to handle appeals and set standards are in place at participating organizations

- A fairer share of cost is assumed by participating associations; they now pay some administrative staff expenses

- COA develops its own bylaws, still within ALA guidelines, in preparation for independence from ALA

- COPA and USDE approval is sought for implemented changes

- COA recommendation reports go directly to participating associations

- ALA's President continues to appoint lay representatives

- Reports on evaluation of completed changes in the accreditation process are submitted to associations

- Appeals and standards are made the responsibility of ad hoc inter-association committees called for by ALA

C. STAGE THREE: FEDERATION

- COA is independent from ALA. The new legal structure is established

- Administrative office of COA remains at ALA Headquarters

- Changes in associations' bylaws and written procedures show their commitment to participate

- Each participating association is paying a fraction of the cost of accreditation based on a formula. ALA is paying by the same formula as other associations

- Appointments of lay representatives rotate among participating organizations

- Appeals and standards are handled by ad hoc inter-association committees called for by COA, with members appointed by participating associations

- COPA and USDE approval is sought for completed changes and planned changes

- The Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation is disbanded after COPA and USDE approval of the new structure is attained. Final reports evaluating implemented changes are submitted to associations

- A committee within COA takes over responsibilities of the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation

CHAPTER 4

WORKING GROUP 2: FINANCE OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

The accreditation of the North American library school programs is currently the responsibility of the American Library Association. The accreditation process itself has several direct and indirect costs currently shared between ALA and the library school or its parent institution.

The interest by a number of other professional associations in participating in the accreditation process raised the question of just what are the costs and who pays for them? A Working Group to study the matter of financing was constituted.

The basic charge to the group was to develop an equitable financing model for the associations and instutitions participating in the accreditation process.

Within this broad charge, the following specific questions were to be explored:

1. Is there an equitable scheme for prorating costs among the participating groups and societies?

2. What specific factors, such as size, membership, organizational budget, number of educational programs sponsored, etc., should be included in cost sharing and cost distribution?

3. What costs should be borne by the participating societies and groups, and what costs should be borne by the institutions?

4. Is there a cost break-even point?

In addition, the group was charged to:

Review the present COA budget and attempt to identify additional costs which will result from adding a number of societies and groups.

Identify possible sources of start-up funding, estimate the amount needed, and for how long the start-up funding should be available.

Estimate the ongoing costs to the constituent groups and societies after start-up funding is withdrawn.

Perhaps it is useful to examine the existing known and estimated costs of accreditation.

1. COA Office 1984/5 (Appendix I):

Salaries/Wages	$87,000		
Operating Expenses	28,000		
Subtotal		$115,000	
Overhead 46%		53,000	
ALA Contributed Services (not in departmental budget)		82,000	
Total			$250,000

2. Volunteers (Appendix II) $270,000

3. Direct and Indirect Costs to Library Schools (Appendix III)

10 schools billed by ALA 1983/84:	$ 25,000		
Self-Study Costs*	375,000		
Subtotal		$400,000	
Overhead 46%		184,000	
Total			$ 584,000
Estimated Grand Total			$1,104,000

* 15 FTE @ $35K = $225
10 FTE @ $15K = $150

The Working Group's primary concern was the costs identified in Category 1 above.

These projections or estimates intend to show that the total cost of accreditation is in excess of one million dollars. The roughly $250,000 paid by the American Library Association represents roughly 23 percent of all direct and indirect costs for the entire estimated cost of accreditation, including Categories 2 and 3 above.

The Working Group estimated that an increase in the number of associations participating in the accreditation process may result in approximately 10 percent higher costs. This will be most visible in the area of direct costs for increased clerical staff, communications, reviews, postage, photocopy, and travel for the central office staff. Other increases are difficult to predict.

The Working Group also assumed that the direct costs for the COA office will be borne by the federated group concerned with accreditation. However, it should be noted here that the burden of costs carried by the institutions being accredited is also high and the

accreditation process should look for ways of curtailing and even cutting these costs by instituting reasonable procedures that are also cost effective. Failure to do so, might further jeopardize the credibility of the accrediting agencies in the view of the parent institutions.

The Working Group focused on possible formulas for the apportionment of costs of accreditation limited to those currently absorbed by ALA. A search for information was conducted to determine how other professions have handled cost-sharing in a federated model. The results of this search are useful, however meager:

1. Formula used by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA)

Organization headquarters and staff are completely (100%) funded by the American Medical Association. When a school or program requires accreditation it petitions the proper association member of the Committee, which charges fees to pay for the accreditation. The member organization then makes a recommendation to the Committee as to accreditation. The Committee coordinates about forty organizations doing accrediting.

Source: Fauser, John G., Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation, American Medical Association, Chicago, Illinois. Telephone conversation, February 1985.

2. Programs for Residency Training

Five groups are involved, each paying $20,000 annually for upkeep. This is a drop in the bucket, however, as their budget is 3.5MM. The rest of the funding comes from the 4,800 programs which are accredited, each of which pays $500 annually for the service. This accrediting body is linked to the American Medical Association, which is contracted to run the program. As a result, the Residency Program does not keep its own accounting, personnel, etc., departments but pays AMA for the service. The program has 35 employees directly. Overheads can be assessed by them easily because AMA is audited by the government for contracts, and assigned specific costs to various services/overheads.

Another important factor is that each "program" accredited derives its funds through insurance (private/public), patient care and government grants, not to mention that there are 4,800 of them. The accrediting body of the five organizations is considered sponsor and forms a council. Historically (prior to 1981) one-half of this body's total costs were funded by the AMA.

Source: Vivian Monty, York University.

3. Formula used by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)

Each of the three groups which make up the Board has one representative on the Board and pays one-third (33%) of the funding for the Board's office and staff. This is regardless of the number of members in each group or the nature of the group's members.

The three groups represent, respectively, architectural schools, architectural firms, and individual architects. The Board also has a student representative and a public representative, neither of whom votes or contributes monetarily. The schools also pay fees for their individual accreditation costs. Despite inequities, the Board has not come up with a better plan since its inception in 1946.

Source: Wilson-Jeronimo, John, National Architectural Accrediting Board, Washington, D.C. Telephone conversation, February 1985.

4. Formula used by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology:

The Board currently represents 19 Participating Bodies and consists of 44 Directors. One-half (50%) of the annual budget is apportioned to the membership on the basis of the number of Representative Directors they have on the Board. One-quarter (25%) is based on the number of paid members in each Participating Body and one-quarter (25%) is based on the number of accredited programs for which the Participating Body holds curricular responsibility. Adjustments are made so the average assessment per member of a Participating Body does not exceed twice the average cost per member for all Participating Bodies.

Source: Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. Fifty-First Annual Report. New York: April 1984.

Other useful sources:

Miller, F. W. "Measuring the Value of Volunteer Efforts.", Association Management 34 (November 1982): 77-79.

National Association of Private Non-traditional Schools and Colleges. Accreditation Fact Sheet. Eric Document #ED208697, Grand Junction, Colorado: September 1981.

Young, Kenneth E., Charles M. Chambers, and H. R. Kells. Understanding Accreditation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The first charge of the new Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation will be to make funding needs explicit, and to help the head of the ALA Committee on Accreditation in preparing documentation for further funding proposals.

   The financial support for the Inter-Association Advisory Committee on Accreditation must be provided by the participating associations. It is anticipated that it will take about $25,000 for the first year's operations. Costs for the first year will include two three-day meetings, ALANET access and administrative support including 1/4 time secretarial help (housed at the ALA COA office).

2. The Working Group on Finance of the Accreditation Process favors cost sharing by formula resulting in a proportional distribution of costs for the central office functions, including overhead. The level of costs as shown by the American Library Association for its Committee on Accreditation seem to be reasonable, including overhead. We do not see the possibility of maintaining high quality and professional services desirable for such an office without higher than the current level of funding.

   Formulas based on such variables as size of organization, size of budget, and number of representatives on COA were considered, plus a base, let's say $5,000 annually. It was not possible for the working group to complete a recommended formula at this time.

   Central office costs shared by participating associations and based proportionally on variables will reflect fiscal ability to participate in the accreditation program. This is viewed as basic to the general health of the new process and should work well for the profession.

3. The other costs of accreditation to be borne by the library science programs and/or their parent institutions. However, great care must be exercised in controlling these costs to maintain the desired balance between cost benefits.

   The procedures imposed upon the institutions by the accrediting agency can greatly influence associated costs. The accreditation must stand the test question: Does the outcome warrant the expense? There is an emerging of values in higher education, including an awareness and desire for accountability for cost effectiveness within quality of education and research. Many university presidents and other chief academic administrators have become skeptical about the professional accreditation process. They have also become concerned about the high cost of the process. This is not surprising, as the Working Group has found that 77 percent of the total cost for accreditation for institutions was borne by the institutions.

4. Therefore, it is recommended that the accrediting agency take a look at its procedures to reduce the fiscal burden on the institutions it accredits.

5. A three-year grant be sought from various funding sources. This grant proposal should seek funding on a sliding scale to help with the phase-in of the costs associated with the new process:

1st year	75% of central office costs
2nd year	50% of central office costs
3rd year	25% of central office costs
4th year	0% of central office costs

APPENDIX I

American Library Association

Departmental Budget Report - Committee on Accreditation
Annual Budget: 9-1-84/8-30-85

Other Revenues	$ 4,500		
Sub-Total Revenue		$ 4,500	
Salaries, Wages & Other			
Professional & Administrative	57,121		
Secretarial & Clerical	12,796		
Benefits	17,298		
Sub-Total Expense		87,215	
Operating Expenses			
Operating Supplies	400		
Postage	530		
Telephone & Telegraph	900		
Printing & Duplicating	850		
Sub-Total Expense		2,680	
Relations w/National Accrediting Groups			
Travel	2,856		
Sub-Total Expense		2,856	
Accreditation of Library School Programs			
Operating Supplies	1,100		
Postage	890		
Telephone & Telegraph	900		
Printing & Duplicating	2,250		
Sub-Total Expense		5,140	
Continuing Review/Visits Etc			
Postage	75		
Travel	12,696		
Printing & Duplicating	125		
Sub-Total Expense		12,896	
Public Representative			
Travel	4,820		
Sub-Total Expense		4,820	
TOTAL LINE ITEM BUDGET			$115,607
Overhead 46%			53,179
ALA hidden costs (including appeals)			82,000
GRAND TOTAL			$250,786

APPENDIX II

Estimate of Dollar Amount of Volunteer Time for COA

1980 - 1981

VISITS:

13 site visits with four members per team = 52 people 5 days per visit, Sunday through Thursday = 260 person days At $250.00 per person day = $65,000.	$ 65,000
Pre- and post-visit homework (writing draft based on anaylsis of self-study report, developing questions, preparing evaluative, verifying all in relation to response from school) at an average of five days per person. At $250.00 per person day = $65,000	65,000
COMMITTEE MEETINGS	
12 persons At 5 days each for Annual Conference & Midwinter = 120 days At 7 days for COA Fall and Spring meetings = 84 days 204 person days at $250.00 per day = $51,000	51,000
COMMITTEE HOMEWORK DURING THE YEAR	
12 persons who read and annotate self-studies and evaluate COA reports twice each year at an average of ten days time At $250.00 per day = $30,000	30,000
TOTAL	$211,000
If estimate is made of COA members personal expenses involved in attentance at Midwinter and Annual Conference (COA Fall and Spring meetings are funded): 10 persons (public representative expenses are paid for all) 10 days at $150.00 per day = $15,000 Travel to and from Annual Conference and Midwinter at $450.00 Round trip for two conferences = $9,000.	$ 24,000
GRAND TOTAL	$235,000

- Unknown are the costs assumed by some site visitors who attend Midwinter or Annual Conference solely to report on the visit to the COA, nor of institutional support through time off allowed to site visitors, reprographic and secretarial support, telephone, etc.
- Above is figured at $250 per 8 hour day. If figure were pro-rated and based on the actual number of hours spent, the total would be substantially higher.
- Additional time is also spent by COA members on sub-committee assignments (e.g., developing draft guideline statements, letters in response to specific questions or problems from schools). No estimate is available.

January 18, 1985

Peter Spyers-Duran, Director
Wayne State University Libraries
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI 48202

Dear Peter Spyers-Duran:

As you requested, enclosed are the Budget and the Actual Expenses for the ALA Committee on Accreditation for the last three years. Our fiscal year runs from 9-1 to 8-31. These are the final figures with year-end corrections. There is also a copy of the current budget.

Elinor Yungmeyer checked with our comptroller on the indirect costs. ALA has an extensive study that found them to be 46% of the direct costs. The indirect costs include telephone, repairs, supplies, building operations, personnel office, distribution center (mail room), reprographics center, headquarters library, data processing, executive office, fiscal services, order services and the public information office. We have a copy of this available but I did not send it as it is rather bulky and did not seem that it would be of special benefit to you. However, if you would like a copy please let me know.

I did a survey on the costs that have been billed to institutions for site visits of their programs, the number of programs and the number who have been revisited during a three year period. This and an estimate of the dollar amount of volunteer time given by various members of the site visit teams and the Committee on Accreditation are also enclosed.

Please let me know if you need more information from us. All of this information is public and may be shared with members of your Working Group.

Sincerely,

Kate Shockey
Administrative Secretary
ALA/USDE Accreditation Project

kps
enclosures

ALA/USDE Accreditation Project 1/18/85

Financial information on costs billed to institutions for Committee on Accreditation Site Visits.

Fiscal Year	# of Visits	Total Costs Billed*	Average Costs Billed**
81/82	12	$31,516.92	$2,570.69
82/83	12	30,880.93	2,573.41
83/84	10	25,005.79	2,500.58
	34	$87,403.64	$2,570.60

*Travel and lodging costs of the visiting team and a $500 administrative charge for each visit. These figures do not include costs of "mini-team" visits.

**The highest cost billed to a single institution during this period was $3,913.44 and the lowest was $1,368.07.

There are presently 67 programs accredited under the 1972 Standards by the American Library Association thru its Committee on Accreditation. Each institution is normally visited on a seven year cycle. Four institutions were denied accreditation when initially visited and were revisited at their request within three years. (All of these programs were subsequently accredited.) Occasionally, when a program is under conditional accreditation or if there is a problem with the annual report, an additional visit out of the normal cycle may be made. Since the adoption of the 1972 Standards, there have been three programs visited by a "mini-team" and two by a full team within three years of a regular visit. Costs of these additional visits are paid by the institution. There is no administrative charge for a mini-team visit.

CHAPTER 5

WORKING GROUP 3: GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUP

1. Clarify the role of goals and objectives in the accreditation process. (Should goals be defined by the program being accredited or by the larger information professions?)

2. Clarify the role of goals and objectives in relation to curriculum.

3. Consider how general goals and objectives relate to society-specific goals and objectives (i.e., those defined by the information profession).

4. Clarify the desired level of goals and objectives - should they be very general and very lofty? Or should they be very specific?

INTRODUCTION

Any educational program must be able to state its purpose, i.e., what it expects to achieve, whether the purpose be lofty or pragmatic. The working out of this statement of purpose is usually framed in terms of goals and objectives. Thus, the statement of purpose, with its goals and objectives, becomes crucial to the process of evaluating an educational program.

The current ferment at all levels of education and the changes in relationships among the professions and the constituencies they serve have affected the library and information professions as well. Is the content of education of high enough quality and rigor? Do students graduate with more knowledge than they had when they entered? How can the public and the profession have confidence that the graduates of library and information studies programs have the requisite knowledge, skills and societal understanding to function in an evolving and technologically sophisticated society? These are questions that concern not only library and information service educators but also the profession itself. Answers to these questions can come only from well defined goals and objectives, as indicated in the paragraphs below.

CONTEXT

The context for this paper is graduate education at the level of the first professional degree, i.e., the master's degree. However, the statements below could be applied to other degree programs as well, should the participating societies agree at some future time to accredit other levels of training. In addition, it is essential that the process of accrediting the master's degree program take into account other degree programs offered by the school or department under review. Such programs can bring considerable strength and enrichment to a master's program and can also compete with the master's program for resources.

The content of the first professional degree is not the only educational preparation for professional practice, and such degree programs should not be evaluated as if it were. Undergraduate education, other graduate education, in-service training and continuing education are all important components, as well. This is not to say that such components can substitute for graduate professional education, but that graduate professional degree programs should be evaluated within the proper context.

Whatever the accreditation process and however it may be changed under (for example) a federated approach, care must be taken not to make the process excessively burdensome for the schools. Universities will not accept a process that crosses the line to prescriptiveness or that is significantly more time-consuming, expensive or cumbersome for the schools than is the present process.

THE ROLE OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

An educational program's statement of goals and objectives is pivotal in the accreditation process. The program is evaluated, in large measure, in terms of the degree to which it achieves its goals and objectives on a continuing basis. In addition, the goals and objectives statement itself is evaluated in the accreditation process, regarding (for example) the extent to which it shows sensitivity to the needs of the field for which accreditation is sought and its adequacy for informing prospective students and employers concerning the program's relevance to their interests.

The appropriate body for defining the goals and objectives of a professional education program is the faculty of that program, working within the guidelines and traditions of the university as a whole. However, the faculty's decisions cannot be made in a vacuum. When an educational program claims to prepare students for practice in a profession, and especially when the program seeks accreditation from the profession, it is important that the faculty understand the profession's perceptions regarding the knowledge, skills and attitudes that are important for successful practice of that profession.

The desirable relationship between educators and the practicing profession is one of interdependence. The profession should continually be elaborating and clarifying its understanding of the knowledge, skills and attitudes that are important for successful professional practice. Such understanding should be articulated in policy documents and position statements that should be taken into account by educators in defining their goals and objectives. On the other hand, the faculties and students of educational programs should be contributing to the commonly held perceptions regarding the needs of the field, through research and publication in the underlying knowledge areas, by sharing insights based on close liaison with the practicing field and through other appropriate means.

THE ROLE OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN RELATION TO THE CURRICULUM

The curriculum may be defined as the experiences a program faculty "consciously provides to assist the formal learning process" (Standards for Accreditation, 1972). Curricular goals and objectives are very important among the goals and objectives for the program as a whole (which will also include, for example, goals and objectives for research and service). The goals for the curriculum should specify in general terms the learning the curriculum is intended to facilitate or the body of knowledge students will possess as a

result of following it. The goals should be sufficiently broad to encompass the various types or aspects of learning that the faculty hopes to accomplish through the curriculum and sufficiently specific or clear to allow the derivation of measurable objectives. The objectives should be specific and measurable and should be used on a continuing basis to test whether or not the curriculum is accomplishing the program's intent.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENERAL AND SOCIETY-SPECIFIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

There are some areas of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are relevant to or necessary for practice in all the professional areas of concern to the various societies that will participate in accreditation. These areas should be ascertainable by the schools through analysis of "major documents and policy statements" (Standards for Accreditation, 1972) that the societies produce, either independently or as part of the accreditation process. These are the areas for which there will be "general" goals and objectives. Any program that seeks accreditation should be required to have goals and objectives that address these common or "general" areas. It is the responsibility of the accrediting body to assist the schools by identifying from the documents and policy statements of the various societies these common or "general" areas, as a basis from which the schools can develop their own goals and objectives.

Beyond these common areas, there will be knowledge, skills and attitudes that various societies consider to be important or necessary for practice in their specialties (also ascertainable through "major documents and policy statements"). Any program that seeks accreditation and purports to prepare students for practice in those specialties should be expected to have goals and objectives that address those skills, knowledge and attitudes. The objectives should make explicit the intended scope and depth of education in the specialties. If a program states such goals and objectives, it should be held accountable to them in the accreditation process.

THE DESIRED LEVEL OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals reflect general aims or accomplishments to be sought on a continuing basis. They are usually stated in conceptual and idealistic terms and are typically at the level of one broad statement for each major aspect of the educational program's activities (e.g., research, service, continuing education, each important option or track in each degree program).

Objectives should be specific, i.e., at the level of one for each significant element of each important aspect of the program. They should be specific enough to be measurable and to indicate the resources necessary for their achievement. For the curriculum, there should be an objective for each significant knowledge area and each significant group of closely related skills or attitudes. These objectives should not be at the level of detail of those for individual courses, but they should be clear and specific enough to guide the development of objectives for individual courses or other learning experiences in the curriculum.

CHAPTER 6

WORKING GROUP 4: GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUP

1. Should there be guidelines of faculty competencies specific to society interests. If so, what?

2. Should there be guidelines relating to the size of the faculty? If so, what?

3. Should there be guidelines concerning general qualifications of faculty with respect to, for example, teaching competency; service to community, university and profession; research productivity and research competency?

4. Should there be guidelines with respect to experience - academic, practice, counselling, other?

5. Should there be guidelines for professional development for faculty - need for retraining, updating, etc.?

I. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

This report has been prepared within the context of the following assumptions:

1. That the faculty of a particular school will define the goals and objectives of its program, design its curriculum and provide the instruction, within the guidelines and traditions of its parent institution;

2. That the faculty has a responsibility for designing a curriculum and providing instruction which will lead to the education of students in the knowledge, skills and attitudes important for successful professional practice in the library and information science professions;

3. That the goals and objectives for accreditation of programs will recognize and link the role of faculty with those goals and objectives;

4. That there will be a close and sustained liaison between faculty and the profession, with exchange of information for the mutual benefit and influence of professional education and practice; and that professional experience will be utilized where it is important to students' understanding of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for professional practice; and,

5. That in academic matters, especially those related to appointment, tenure and related areas, institutional prerogatives must take precedence.

II. PREAMBLE

To be accreditable, a library and information science program must be supported by a corps of faculty members who bring together all of the knowledge and expertise necessary to educate graduates who are professionally competent in those areas of library and information work offered by the school.

The success of the instructional and research programs of a school is dependent upon the ability of its faculty to teach, stimulate independent thinking, remain abreast of intellectual and technological developments, and provide stability and continuity. The size and caliber of the faculty should reflect the nature of the school's goals and objectives for library and information science education and the values placed upon student-teacher relationships in the learning process. Research enriches both teaching and learning, and provides means for adding to a body of professional knowledge. Professional experience and participation in professional organizations, including specialist societies, enable faculty members to contribute to the solution of problems in library and information science and to keep abreast of the concerns of the information environment.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS ON SPECIFIC CHARGES

A. Institutional Prerogatives and the Accreditation Process

Program evaluation is a joint enterprise between institutions of higher education and the accrediting body. The appraisal of the faculty relating to teaching loads and conditions, research, professional activities, faculty welfare and compensation, faculty rank and tenure, and faculty role in institutional governance is achieved in relation to the institution's objectives and in light of its financial resources. For that reason guidelines on faculty must be seen in the context of institutional prerogatives.

The relationship between institutional prerogatives and the accreditation process, with respect to faculty, must be resolved in favor of the institution since it is the organization primarily responsible for establishing standards for faculty appointment, promotion and tenure. Those institutions also set standards for work load, establish policies for faculty sabbatical and other leaves, set guidelines for compensation, and other matters related to the higher education institutions' mission.

Standards and guidelines for faculty in programs of library and information science must respect those prerogatives. However, guidelines may properly be used to evaluate faculty against a school's or program's stated objectives, and may be used to raise questions concerning the extent to which an institution's prerogatives inhibit or advance a program's ability to meet its objectives and educate students for careers in library and information science.

B. General Qualifications for Faculty

A school should have a corps of full-time faculty members, in accordance with the institution's approved policies and procedures on affirmative action, academically qualified for appointment to graduate faculty within the institution and sufficient in number to

carry out the major share of the teaching and research requirements of the general program and the specializations offered. When appropriate, part-time faculty members may be appointed to complement the teaching competencies of the full-time faculty members in both the general program and the specializations. Among faculty there should be a balance between academic background and professional experience commensurate with the goals and objectives of the program. In addition, opportunity should be provided to faculty to enable them to renew themselves, to develop new areas of expertise and to improve their overall teaching and research effectiveness.

Criteria for general qualifications of faculty should be included in the proposed guidelines. Specifically the faculty as a group should show evidence of the qualifications enumerated below. The qualifications of each faculty member should meet the general criteria, while there should also be evidence of competency in assigned areas of specialization.

1. Academic Qualifications: To support the goals and objectives of the program including a diversity of backgrounds, represented by advanced degrees from different institutions and appropriate qualifications for the specializations; and inter-disciplinary representation from within the school and across the university as needed for the program.

2. Scholarship: As demonstrated by research competency and research record, through recent publication in refereed publications, and through other evidence of scholarship.

3. Experience: In a wide variety of areas of library and information work as required to support the goals and objectives of the program and gained through direct and indirect contact with the fields represented in the program.

4. Professional Activity: Through membership and active participation in associations; through creative professional activity in work as consultants, association officers, committee members, speakers, research projects, seminar participation, etc.; and through liaison with library and other information professions.

5. Community Service: Through service to the institution and the school as chairpersons, committee members and through interdisciplinary activities; and through service to the professional and informational communities by participation in professional activities, continuing education, consultancies, research projects, etc.

6. Subject Expertise: Through up-to-date, in-depth knowledge and expertise to support the objectives of the program, including the specializations.

7. Teaching Effectiveness: Through an evaluative process which includes input from peers and students, and through course syllabi and materials; the evaluation to be used constructively in faculty development.

C. Faculty Competencies Specific to Society Interests

Faculty competencies specific to society interests should meet the requirements of the institution and the goals and objectives of the program and its specializations. In addition to the general competencies required to support a program, faculty having more specialized skills and abilities should staff the specializations where required. Competency is defined as the knowledge, abilities and skills necessary for effective professional performance in a specialization. Measures of potential effectiveness which could be used to demonstrate competency in the specializations should be developed. As the best sources of information, the accrediting body should assume responsibility for soliciting the relevant societies to suggest measures of effectiveness which could be included in an addendum to the standards and made available to library and information science programs as an aid in appointing faculty to teach the specializations. Such measures of effectiveness might include, for example, personal membership and active participation in relevant professional societies, relevant work experience, relevant publications, consulting experience, etc.

D. Faculty Experience

Experience is desirable and perhaps necessary, in some course areas, but the guidelines should be interpreted broadly. Experience is referred to in the introductory statement in the current Standards for Accreditation (page 6) and included in the list of general qualifications suggested in this report. The guidelines or standards should state that professional experience of faculty should be appropriate to goals and objectives of the program, including the specializations. The societies should be asked to provide or develop non-prescriptive guidelines appropriate to their particular specializations, since the societies themselves are the most expert judges of the requirements for their specializations.

E. Size of Faculty

The guidelines or standards should state that the size of the faculty be appropriate to the goals and objectives of the program and strongly support the core curriculum and the specializations offered. The faculty-student ratio should allow adequate time for the counselling of students and intellectual interaction between faculty and students.

CHAPTER 7

WORKING GROUP 5: GUIDELINES FOR CURRICULUM

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUP

1. What should the general approach to curricular issues be - on a continuum which runs from "sidestepping curricular definitions" to "a series of definitions, course descriptions, etc."?

2. What should the approach be to:

   definition if any of core curriculum/competencies?

   society-specific specializations - narrow specialities within information science/library science (note overlay with Working Group on Guidelines for Society-Specific Objectives)?

   specializations outside information science/librarianship which encompass broader fields?

   quality - should we try to define, or simply validate that courses/programs exist?

   joint-degree programs?

   at what level is the first degree granted?

3. Catagorize the spectrum of information disciplines and define what our accreditation process covers. (Note overlay with Working Group on Organization of the Accreditation Process.) Should it cover, e.g., information management in other schools?

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The Working Group on Curriculum was directed to examine the general approach to be taken on curricular issues, the definition of the core curriculum, specializations, the problem of evaluating quality, joint-degree programs, the level of the first professional degree and how to array the spectrum of the information disciplines in order to define what the accreditation process should cover.

To tackle these issues, we have organized this paper into six additional sections. Section II begins with a broad definition of the field. From this we proceed in Section III to examine the various specialties that should be included in a revised accreditation standard mentioning some of the joint-degree programs that already exist and concluding with a statement on the larger mission to be addressed by library and information science education. Section IV identifies the need for a common core, the assumption used in its

development, and outlines the knowledges, tools and skills to be included. Section V addresses the question of what should be accredited — a degree program, specialties within a degree and/or the institution — and what the level of accreditation should be — undergraduate, master's or other. Several alternative scenarios are provided. A strong statement of the responsibility that must be assumed by associations who wish to be included in the accreditation process is also provided. Section VI discusses the issue of how the quality of a program can be indicated by identifying a set of questions to be addressed. The concluding section summarizes the work of the Group and presents the general approach we believe should be taken with regard to curricular issues. Appendix I is an example from the Medical Library Association of the kind of competency statement that might serve as a model for other associations wishing to be involved in the accreditation process.

II. DEFINITION OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Before beginning any discussion of requirements for a library and information science curriculum, it is necessary to define the parameters of the field. The following five areas, which comprise our definition of library and information science, must be reflected in the curriculum:

1. The basic functions carried out in the field are the following: collecting, organizing, storing, preserving, retrieving, analyzing, synthesizing, interpreting, repackaging and managing information.

2. The media involved, both print and electronic, include data/information in textual, numeric, bibliographic, graphic and audio forms.

3. The individuals and groups to be served include but are not limited to, the following: preschool children, elementary and high school students, college and university undergraduate and graduate students, scholars and researchers, government officials and agencies, business and industry, professionals, private citizens, householders and hobbyists.

4. Various job activities include: production, marketing, training, management, consultation, analysis, design, providing information, categorizing information, packaging information, plus decision-making relative to the retention and storing format of information.

5. The environments in which these functions and activities take place include, but are not limited to, the following: libraries, information centers, government agencies, corporations and private companies, not-for-profit institutions, the information industry, independent brokers and consultants.

For all these areas, the curriculum should reflect a perspective from past history as well as current information problems and needs.

III. PROGRAM CONTENT

A changed accreditation process suggests defining a broader role for library and information science education than has been necessary in the past. From that broader role, it

seems likely that a larger constituency in the overall information field will need to work together and to be involved in the accreditation process. As circumstances have changed and as more graduates of the presently accredited library/information science programs have entered a wide variety of information-related positions, existing curricula will need to reflect topics ranging from archives to electronic publishing. Among these are the following:

- Archives
- Database Management
- Documentation
- Information Science
  - The Behavior of Information Within Systems
  - The Behavior of People Toward Information
  - Communications
  - Decision Support Systems
  - Information Control
  - Information Transfer and Delivery
  - The Management of Information Systems Publishing
  - Records Management

The increasing interdisciplinary nature of library and information science lends itself to joint/dual degree programs. A review of the catalogs of presently accredited programs indicates a wide range of interdisciplinary courses/programs:

Dual-Degree Programs:

- American Studies
- Art History
- Bi-lingual
  - Bi-cultural
  - Foreign Languages
- Biology
- Business (MBA)
- Chemistry
- Children's and Adolescent Literature
- Communication
- Computer and Information Science
- Earth Sciences
- Education
- English
- Geography
- Health and Medical Sciences
- History
- Industrial Engineering and Operations Research
- Industrial Technology
- Latin American Studies
- Law
- Music
  - History
  - Musicology
- Near Eastern Studies
- Pharmaceutical Sciences

Physics
Conservation/Preservation of Materials
Public Administration
Social Studies
Social Work

Programs, not Dual-Degrees:
Agricultural
Gerontology
International Studies
Rare Books

IV. THE CORE CURRICULUM

We believe with Evans and others that "There is a core knowledge for the information professional."[1] In 1954, Lester Asheim defined the "core curriculum" as "that part of the total curriculum that must be mastered by everyone no matter what specialization he aims for."[2] Grogan comments, that although there is heated discussion about whether or not there is a core, "For much of the last 100 years, there has been a remarkable degree of unanimity about what Shera has called 'the old quadrivium of cataloging, book selection, reference and administration'."[3] He summarizes, "Opponents of the concept of a core face a dilemma: if there is no core, what is professional about an occupation that lacks a central essential body of knowledge?"[4] We concur with his opinion.

Recently UNESCO has been working to establish a core for library science, information science and archival fields.[5] The Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association in its 1972 Standards for library and information science educational programs has surprisingly little to say on content or core knowledge required, unlike the standards for the accrediting bodies from other professional fields.

It seems reasonable to define more fully what components might comprise core knowledge in the field.

Core Knowledge Requirements

The following assumptions apply:

1. Basic principles and concepts (i.e. content) can be specified.

2. The particular manifestation of the content should be left to individual schools, i.e., whether required courses, series of electives, experiences, competencies, etc.

3. The core content applies to all levels of program — undergraduate, master's, advanced certificate, doctorate - however, with different levels of sophistication and different levels of emphasis.

4. The core content applies with varying emphasis to all areas of library/information science fields.

5. The information field is dynamic with new approaches and application areas emerging rapidly with substantial convergence among the archipelago of information sciences. The core of an information program should cover the fundamental aspects of the basic functions described above (II.1) but should not be so extensive as to mitigate against flexibility in curriculum and program design.

The core content for all levels of information science instruction may be loosely organized into the following three categories: knowledge, tools and skills.

A. Knowledge Areas

1. Philosophy and Background, e.g., foundations or principles of information and society.

2. Environmental and Contextual Knowledge, e.g., information environments, type and functions of information institutions, economics of information, politics of information.

3. Management Knowledge, e.g., organization theory, management principles, personnel and human relations, finance and budgeting, and enterprise analysis.

B. Tool Areas

1. Quantitative/Analytical Tools, e.g., systems analysis, research methods, descriptive statistics, logic and information requirement determination.

2. Bibliographic and Organizational Tools, e.g., cataloging and classification, abstracting and indexing, bibliographic control, data structure, data normalization, collection development, selection, acquisition, and technical services.

C. Skill Requirements

1. Communication Skills, e.g., effective written and oral presentations, effective expression, and effective organization of presentations.

2. Technological Skills, e.g., application programming, online searching, database design, database management, systems utilization, and up-to-date knowledge of new developments.

3. Interpersonal Skills, e.g., reference interview, information requirements, determination, and cognitive psychology.

V. ACCREDITABLE PROGRAMS/DEGREES

Recommendations can be made on accreditable programs/degrees with more than one scenario possible. Three of these scenarios follow:

1. Accreditation of one umbrella program

In this scenario, the program, in order to satisfy the definitions above, would have to be a program that embraced a large variety of skills/competencies, and therefore, probably a considerable amount of interdisciplinary study. A typical program would probably include a required baccalaureate degree with an interdisciplinary major, and a graduate degree that would build on the baccalaureate. Although the graduate degree program would be the accredited one, it would be structured on the assumption that a related baccalaureate preceded it.

2. Accreditation of specialty degrees/programs

In this scenario, the library/information science unit would offer a number of degrees/programs, with each one oriented to a particular area of the information environment. Accreditation would be sought for those programs selected by the institutions, and the choices would determine the degree of participation in the whole accreditation process.

Such a scenario might continue to envision a graduate program in library/information science with no undergraduate component located in the school.

3. Accreditation of schools

With a multiplicity of specialties embraced in a library/information science unit, it may be feasible simply to accredit the degree granting unit, rather than the program(s). Perhaps the time has come to investigate this option as a means of projecting some control over the great variety of programs in library and information science.

It should be stressed that curricular decisions will and should remain the purview of the degree-granting institution; however, the profession at large and the associations specifically involved in the accreditation process will need to serve in an advisory capacity to programs. This advisory capacity may well run the gamut from individuals serving on advisory/visiting boards of specific institutions to general educational statements prepared by library/information science professional associations.

Although it is likely that the master's program will continue to be the accredited program in the future, continued consideration should be given to the possibility of the accreditation of schools rather than programs. In view of the increasing expansion of specialties into degree programs, it is the preference of this Working Group that future plans take into account all of the information-related programs of the institution.

At the very least, each association should set up a mechanism whereby its particular educational needs and concerns can be translated into a statement of competencies/capabilities/skills which can be made available both to institutions and to individuals. An example of such a statement is that prepared by the Medical Library Association as a part of its certification process. (See Appendix I) It seems appropriate for development of an educational policy statement to be a condition of participation in the accreditation process.

VI. QUALITY OF CURRICULUM

Quality cannot be quantitatively defined nor validated. However, we believe firmly that a well-chosen accrediting team has the ability to recognize quality as well as to render meaningful evaluations and recommendations pertaining to the quality of courses/ programs. We equally firmly believe that an accreditation program is worthless if it does not evaluate on the basis of quality.

The following list of questions should be addressed by the accrediting team in examining quality. The list is illustrative and does not encompass all aspects of quality. Moreover, it must be viewed as a totality as no one item or group of items can delineate quality in its entirety.

- Is course content up-to-date, incorporating recent technological and conceptual advancements?
- Is there a correlation between course content and the qualifications of faculty to teach the specific course?
- Are students required to utilize higher levels of thinking and examine material on a conceptual basis?
- How is mastery of basic competencies measured? (E.g., through a competency examination or through instructor evaluation?)
- Is there evidence of a spiraling curriculum where courses and concepts build upon each other?
- Does course work support the specialization that the particular school purports to offer?
- Does the nature of assignments encourage imagination, creativity, and demonstration of the knowledge of the field?
- Are students entering the program prepared to master the core competencies?
- Are facilities adequate to support an up-to-date program?
- Are employment patterns analyzed and transmitted to students through counselling and/or placement offices?

VII. A RECOMMENDED APPROACH TO A CURRICULUM STANDARD

Although it would be tempting to write more prescriptive standards, including (for curriculum) a series of definitions, course descriptions, etc., the authors fear that such an approach might result in a "chilling" of the academic environments that provide library education. It will remain extremely important to allow library and information science education programs to think creatively about how MLS students would best be educated for the information environments of the eighties and nineties. On the other hand, to write

totally non-prescriptive requirements, to sidestep definitions, is not a viable choice in 1985, since the profession recognizes that the input of practice is vital to building programs that will relate to the working environment, and this necessitates more specific standards than those we presently have.

A role somewhere between sidestepping and prescribing would seem to be the most desirable, leading to the development of conceptual definitions and enough specifics to serve as an umbrella for developing the curriculum in line with the complex environment served, but not forgetting the basic goals of the profession in serving the educational, recreational and informational needs of its public.

Footnotes

[1]Evans, G. Edward. "Teaching New Technologies: Whose Role Is It?", presented at IFLA General Conference, Munich, 1983.

[2]Asheim, Lester, Ed. The Core of Education for Librarianship. Chicago: ALA, 1954.

[3]Grogan, D. J. "Education for Librarianship." Education for Information 1(1983): 3-23.

[4]Ibid.

[5]UNESCO. International Symposium on Harmonization of Education and Training Programmes in Information Science, Librarianship and Archival Studies. Paris: Unesco, 1984.

APPENDIX I

As referenced in Section V.3, each association is urged to set up a mechanism whereby its concerns can be translated into an educational policy statement. An example of such a statement follows. The Medical Library Association developed the competencies for health science librarians in conjunction with the Association's certification program, and they will be utilized through 1986 when the nature of the certification program will change.

MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

COMPETENCIES FOR HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARIANS

PUBLIC SERVICES

Subfunction - Reference: Bibliographic and Information Services

* 1. Determines user information needs through appropriate strategies, e.g., reference interview.
* 2. Selects appropriate search strategy based on available resources, time constraints, costs, etc.
* 3. Evaluates search results, and selects relevant items based on user's needs.
4. Selects methods for providing current awareness services.

Subfunction - Interlibrary Loan: Print and Nonprint Materials

* 5. Determines sources to be used in verifying citations and most effective order for checking.
6. Determines most appropriate holdings lists for locating materials and most effective order for checking, based on time and cost factors, and appropriate procedures.
7. Determines method for locating desired materials that could not be found in available lists of holdings.
8. Collects and uses interlibrary loan statistics to improve library operations and services.
9. Establishes interlibrary loan procedures in compliance with current copyright regulations.

Subfunction - Circulation Services

10. Determines most effective circulation system based on cost factors, staffing requirements, control, locator and security features.

Subfunction - User Education

11. Plans a user education program based on the information needs of the population to be served.
12. Designates specific content areas for coverage to achieve the primary instructional goals.

*Competencies of critical significance to MLA Certification Examination.

13. Chooses most appropriate instructional method for material to be covered.
14. Evaluates user education programs.

TECHNICAL SERVICES

Subfunction - Collection Development and Selection Policies

1. Evaluates methods of data collection and user results to improve collection development.
* 2. Chooses books, journals and nonprint materials to be added and dropped from the collection based on a weighted consideration of user choice, interlibrary loan requests, citation frequency, circulation records, and publications quality.
3. Uses appropriate reference tools to select library materials relevant to a given content area.
4. Decides on gift acceptance by weighing all factors: value of gift, stature of donor, library staff and space limitations for gift processing, and library gift handling policies.

Subfunction - Acquisitions Procedures; Vendor Relationships; Fiscal Control

5. Determines methods for verifying availability of library materials by checking appropriate acquisitions tools.
6. Determines most economical and prompt method for replacement of library materials.
7. Decides on a course of action to evaluate an inadequate source based upon the record of past performance and costs incurred by a source change.
8. Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of ordering from agents as opposed to ordering directly from publishers, based on fees, services, and in-house costs.
9. Identifies factors which will influence the expenditure projection for the next year.

Subfunction - Cataloging; Cataloging Copy; Catalog and File Maintenance; Card Production

10. Identifies descriptive cataloging requirements and selects appropriate access points.
11. Chooses appropriate classification numbers from NLM Classification based on current cataloging principles.
12. Chooses appropriate subject headings based on an understanding of MeSH vocabulary and the principles of application.
13. Chooses a classification scheme based on the data collected regarding collection scope, growth potential, strengths and weaknesses of the various schemes, availability of classification copy, and classification schemes used by nearby libraries.
14. Identifies and solves cataloging problems.
15. Identifies existing cataloging copy sources and chooses the one most suitable to the library.
16. Evaluates characteristics of subject heading lists, name and series authorities and card catalog arrangements in terms of collection scope, ease of access, compatibility with the classification scheme, user preferences, etc.

17. Chooses subject heading lists, name and series authorities and card catalog arrangements based on the evaluation of the characteristics of each file to be established.
18. Evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of each method of catalog card production in light of the library's needs, based on costs, time factors, reliability, etc.

Subfunction - Binding Policies and Standards

19. Decides retention periods for journal titles based on space needs, access through indexes, use, and ease of storage and access as they relate to journals being bound or not.

20. Identifies components of binding and the binding process for which specifications should be written.

Subfunction - Automation of Technical Services

21. Determines the factors to be considered in assessing the needs of technical services operations which are to be automated.
22. Chooses a system of automation based on technical services needs and advantages and disadvantages of available systems.

Subfunction - Serials Control

23. Identifies and chooses effective and efficient procedures for serial claims which take into consideration publishing patterns of serials, agency restrictions, and service demands on the library.
24. Evaluates and selects a serials record-keeping arrangement based on the library's needs and limitations.
25. Identifies and solves serial control problems.

ADMINSTRATION

Subfunction - Budgeting

1. Determines information needed to prepare budgets of different types.
* 2. Identifies factors to be considered in planning a budget such as institutional requirements, department needs, and external factors.
3. Determines past expenditures, projected needs, and cost increases for each category in the budget.
4. Assesses unit needs and priorities based on data collected.
5. Prepares a budget based on past allocations, current budgetary guidelines, department priorities and needs, including prioritization and justification of requests in each category.
6. Evaluates and makes recommendations about additional sources of support, e.g., user fees, grants, etc.

Subfunction - Planning and Organizing

7. Determines possible sources and data collection methods for identifying library and institutional goals.
* 8. Sets library goals consistent with overall institutional goals and with effective library practices and user needs.
9. Formulates policy statements based on institutional and library goals, service needs, and available resources.
10. Plans and organizes library operations based on factors such as library services, available personnel, outside contracts, and costs.
11. Examines appropriate roles and relationships between the library, the institution's administration, and the library committee.
12. Determines physical facilities needed, in terms of collection, staff and user space, special requirements of various types of materials, and institutional and library growth rates.
13. Chooses among methods for more effective use of available library space, including utilization of other collections, cooperative arrangements such as networks or consortia, storage of materials, or alternative types of materials (e.g., microforms).
14. Assesses the feasibility of interlibrary cooperative services.

Subfunction - Evaluating, Controlling and Directing

15. Evaluates methods of data collection and uses results to improve library services.
16. Evaluates library goals in relation to institutional needs.
17. Evaluates operations to determine whether library goals are met.

Subfunction - Personnel

18. Evaluates adequacy of personnel utilization based on available positions, tasks to be performed, costs analysis, etc.
19. Prepares or updates position descriptions based on an analysis of library needs.
20. Recruits, interviews, evaluates, and selects candidates.
21. Determines orientation and training requirements based on position description and individual's qualifications.
22. Evaluates employee performance.

Subfunction - Communicating

23. Prepares reports, identifying: purpose of report, topics for inclusion, information needed, and preferred format.
24. Assesses one's role in group and interpersonal communications situations.
25. Uses principles which facilitate effective committee functioning.

CHAPTER 8

WORKING GROUP 6: GUIDELINES FOR SOCIETY-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

I. REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP

This report reflects the discussion of the Working Group on Society-Specific Objectives, plus additional materials supplied by the members.

The societies with representatives attending the meetings, or contributing materials to this working paper include the Society of American Archivists (SAA), the American Library Association (ALA), the American Society for Information Science (ASIS), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), the Canadian Library Association (CLA), the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE), the Medical Library Association (MLA), the Special Libraries Association (SLA) and the Association of American Law Libraries (AALL).

A. Summary of Charges

The Working Group on Guidelines for Society-Specific Objectives was charged by the Steering Committee to address certain topics. These topics are:

1. What are the unique needs of each society? In what areas do societies have goals specific and separate from the communal goals of the federation?

2. Who will decide what society goals are adapted by the federation?

3. How should these objectives be incorporated in the accreditation process?

4. Who will decide whether a program is meeting these objectives?

5. Assume a school chooses whether it will offer itself for accreditation in an area of emphasis or concentration. What, if any, action will be taken to distinguish a general program accreditation from accreditation for stated areas of emphasis? By what criteria are the schools offering specializations accredited?

B. Unique Needs of the Societies

Each society representative was requested to submit a statement of desired educational outcomes for professionals who are members of their respective societies. In addition, a formal statement of expectations of a professional was requested of the participating societies.

Some societies, due to their annual meeting schedule, were unable to provide a formal statement prior to the deadline. In such a case, the informal statement of desired educational outcomes from the society's respresentative has been the basis for determining the

unique needs of the society. The formal statement from each participating society would be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation at some future date. The full text of any statements appear in the appendices to this paper.

Several particular concerns of the societies present came out in the discussion. Several societies, in particular ARL, aggressively opposed the federated model of accreditation. Their objection centered on a reluctance to introduce further bureaucracy and expense into the accreditation process. It is feared that schools will avoid and/or refuse accreditation if the perceived value of accreditation does not outweigh the perceived cost. A recommendation was forwarded to the Working Group on Organization to consider this concern and address it appropriately in any recommended model of organization.

Other concerns of individual societies focused on insuring that the accreditation standards address the education needed by professionals. Some societies, in particular SAA and ASIS, pointed out the MLS is not the only degree accepted as a criteria for professional positions held by their members. SAA recognizes the need for an advanced degree, but feels an MA or Ph.D. in disciplines related to archives is an acceptable alternative. The ASIS concerns relate to relative volatility of jobs within information science. Some professional positions held by members have educational needs that are not appropriately addressed by MLS programs. As in the case of SAA, degrees in other disciplines related to information science have been acceptable as educational preparation.

Further discussion led to an agreement that the basic educational outcomes desired by the societies were essentially the same. In particular, the preliminary working paper by the Curriculum Group was examined and favorably received. It was suggested the desired educational outcomes be the basis for accreditation as a professional, rather than a specific route and/or course and/or degree. For effective implementation of the accreditation process this Working Group recommends the participating societies submit the aforementioned formal statements of educational outcomes. The societies will provide current guidelines and other recommendations to the accreditation team and the schools.

C. Deciding Society Goals for the Federation

Based on preliminary discussion of the Curriculum Working Group's draft paper, it is believed a common core content of knowledge can be designated. This core would be acceptable to all the societies, and should form a foundation of accreditation. Specific needs of societies would be covered as described in the section on areas of concentration and specialization.

Particular emphasis should be laid on providing guidelines that consider the broader goals of information professionals in society today. Goals should be focused on providing the first professional degree. Continuing education, though essential for the continuing development of a professional, should not be considered in this accreditation. The societies have taken the responsibility for providing appropriate continuing education for their members. A concern was raised about the impact of continuing education on the faculty of library schools. Faculty time spent in non-accredited activities, such as continuing education, should not be allowed to unfavorably impinge on time devoted to accredited activities. A recommendation to that effect was made to the Working Group on Faculty.

D. Incorporating Objectives into Accreditation

Discussion among the societies led to a consensus that current accreditation is not reflecting the needs of the societies. The questions on the self-study do not consider areas of concern to the societies.

The Working Group recommends the societies contribute to the self-study guidelines through whatever process or committee that is appropriate to the society. Their input will insure that the self-study more appropriately evaluates those areas of specialization pertinent to a society.

E. Deciding if a Program Meets Objectives

The Working Group declined to recommend action on this charge. Discussion led to the conclusion that the organization model must include some provision for deciding whether a program meets the guidelines. Therefore, the accreditation organization proposed by the Organization Working Group will have the authority to establish whether a program meets the objectives.

F. Areas of Emphasis and/or Specialization

Of particular concern to the participating societies was the development of areas of emphasis and/or specialization. It was acknowledged that the verbal reputation of various schools has created a sort of unofficial "major" in some areas.

The Working Group feels COA must develop a mechanism to evaluate a stated specialization through the pertinent societies relating to that specialization. This would include the action proposed above. That is, societies would contribute to the self-study guidelines to insure it appropriately evaluates topics relating to areas of specialization. The society may opt to send a member on a site visit as an observer.

It should be noted that schools are specifically evaluated for STATED specializations. A school would state how it is providing the specialization through its goals and objectives. During the accreditation process the team will examine the school's statement of specialization in the light of the guidelines of the pertinent societies. The accreditation will note whether specialized evaluations were performed on a stated area of emphasis. The absence of such evaluations should indicate the absence of stated areas of specialization and/or emphasis.

Acknowledgements

The assistance of all the Working Group members, present and past, to prepare this paper is gratefully acknowledged. These members include Ann Morgan Campbell (SAA), Alice B. Ihrig (ALA), Jean Orpwood (CLA), Margot McBurney (ARL), Stephen E. James (ALISE), Shirley Echelman (ARL), Judith Wright (AALL), and Mary Lou Stursa (SLA). The special contributions of Trudy A. Gardner (MLA) as recording secretary, Hope Coffman (SLA) as previous chairperson, and Beth Miller (CLA/ALA) as Steering Committee liaison were also invaluable in preparing this report.

II. STATEMENTS BY VARIOUS ASSOCIATIONS

A. MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION: Statement of Educational Outcomes

The following is based on a preliminary draft of the objectives as outlined by the MLA Certification Committee. These objectives were used by MLA to design new Continuing Education courses in June of 1985. The MLA representative has also included some objectives to address general area competencies.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

I. CORE CONTENT

A. Public Service Objectives:

1. Be able to identify information needs of patrons.
2. Understand how information of different types (e.g., science, social science, humanities, general, etc.) is organized and transmitted.
3. Be able to discriminate between types of information sources, their formats and characteristics.
4. Be able to identify and select reference works specific to the needs of the library environment.
5. Be able to plan services based on anticipated information needs of users and facilitate access to resources.
6. Be able to determine educational objectives in the design of instructional programs appropriate to the needs of specific groups.
7. Understand basic concepts of online search systems, including unit record structure, controlled versus natural language vocabulary, and Boolean logic.
8. Be able to evaluate results of the information search and select most appropriate items for specific information needs.
9. Be able to recognize and apply appropriate strategy when local resources are exhausted.
10. Be able to identify appropriate online and print sources for verification.
11. Understand ALA policies for interlibrary loans.
12. Be able to interpret the Copyright law of 1978 in regard to interlibrary loans.
13. Be able to interpret the Copyright law of 1978 in regard to reserve materials.
14. Be able to interpret the Copyright law of 1978 in regard to photocopying of library materials.
15. Have a basic working ability to query OCLC for library holdings.
16. Have a basic understanding of the most common union lists and finding tools for interlibrary loans.
17. Have a basic understanding of the implications of censorship issues in the library.
18. Have a basic understanding of the freedom of information act.

B. Technical Services:

1. Identifies elements of a collection development policy.
2. Knows the purpose of a collection development policy.

3. Selects materials based on criteria outlined in the policy.
4. Identifies and applies selection criteria for different types of materials.
5. Identifies and applies appropriate tools to measure collection strengths.
6. Knows online and print bibliographic verification sources.
7. Selects appropriate online and print sources for bibliographic verification.
8. Knows criteria for selecting a vendor or sources for ordering.
9. Knows the criteria for choosing a classification scheme.
10. Understands the arrangement of the most common classifications in use in the U.S. — Dewey, LC, NLM.
11. Identifies appropriate cataloging tools and online print sources for classification information.
12. Chooses the cataloging tools and online and print sources for bibliographic information that are most suitable to the library.
13. Knows the application of descriptive cataloging for the most common classifications in use in the U.S.
14. Identifies appropriate cataloging tools and online and print bibliographic sources of information for descriptive cataloging information.
15. Chooses the level of descriptive detail most suitable to the library.
16. Knows the criteria for choosing an appropriate subject heading authority list.
17. Chooses appropriate subject headings and subheadings based on a basic understanding of the vocabulary and principles of application of the most common classifications in use in the U.S.

C. Other Areas of Importance:

1. Have a basic understanding of one programming language.
2. Be able to use one microcomputer software package.

B. SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION: Statement of Educational Outcomes

The following is derived from long-range plan of the association to address graduate education and accreditation. In addition, SLA has two research studies underway to provide a basis for both the guidelines and policy statements concerning special educational outcomes.

PRIORITY A - CONTINUING EDUCATION

Goal

The Association will assess the education needs of information professionals and maintain an Education Committee, staff and a continuing education program to aid in professional development.

Objectives

- Develop a policy statement on professional development for education for SLA.
- Increase awareness of SLA continuing education programs and encourage participation by the membership and other professionals.
- Strengthen the Regional Continuing Education and Middle Management Certificate programs.
- Provide a staff member at the Association Office with a background in professional education, who will develop and coordinate the Association's continuing education programs for library and information professionals.
- Provide a career development component to be offered at each annual conference in conjunction with the Employment Clearinghouse activities.
- Identify the different types and levels of jobs for information professionals and develop continuing education programs to meet the needs of these groups.
- Plan an Executive Development program for special library managers/directors.

Action Plan

In support of the above objectives, the Education Committee and an Association Office staff member will be assigned the responsibility to develop an implementation plan to be submitted to the Association Office for review and further development, and then reported back to the Board. After approval of the plan by the Board, the Association Office staff will be responsible for implementing the operational plan.

PRIORITY E - GRADUATE EDUCATION AND ACCREDITATION

Goal

The Association will become a full participant in the Graduate Library and Information Management Accreditation process.

Objectives

- Develop an Association policy on graduate education for special librarianship.
- Work with other information-related organizations to identify and forecast the marketplace for employment of special librarians/information professionals and to identify ways in which library schools might best meet these needs.
- Encourage chapter members to serve on advisory councils of the graduate schools of library and information science.
- Provide guidelines for educating and training special librarians/information managers and submit them to the deans of library and information science schools for consideration and implementation.
- Negotiate for an official SLA representative on the ALA Committee on Accreditation and develop a roster of SLA members to serve on site visiting teams of the Committee on Accreditation.

Action Plan

In support of the above objectives, the Education Committee and an Association Office staff member will be assigned the responsibility to develop an implementation plan to be submitted to the Association Office for review and further development, and then reported back to the Board. After approval of the plan by the Board, the Association Office staff will be responsible for implementing the operational plan.

In addition, the SLA representative identified a "more formal role in graduate education for librarianship/information management." Guidelines developed will relate to training in areas of technology, problem solving, communication, and other areas of information management.

As of June 14, 1985, the SLA Board also approved a policy statement on graduate education which states:

Special Libraries Association believes that graduate education should adequately prepare students for special librarianship/information management.

The Association will:

- support formal library and information science education;
- form an integral partnership with educators of special library/information professionals to monitor the changing work and technology environments;
- participate in the accreditation process for graduate library/information science education;
- encourage its members, through Chapter networks or as alumni, to become active in their local schools of library/information science; and
- assist in monitoring the skills and competencies required for special library/information management.

C. THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS: Statement of Educational Outcomes

The following is a portion of a document prepared by the SAA's Committee on Education and Professional Development that suggests minimum acceptable requirements for graduate archival education programs. The SAA representative expressed the sentiment that this group would find the work done by the curriculum group of the COA/USDE project helpful.

GUIDELINES FOR GRADUATE ARCHIVAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Listing in this directory does not imply accreditation or endorsement by the Society of American Archivists. At present, the SAA does not accredit archival education and training programs, institutes, or courses. However, the SAA Committee on Education and Professional Development has prepared guidelines for graduate archival education programs. The guidelines, which have been approved by the SAA Council, follow.

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines provide a basic program for archival education as part of a graduate degree. This program would be offered in an accredited college or university with appropriate instructional resources - including an established archival program of its own - and with cooperative arrangements with other established archival repositories. The program director must be an archivist whose credentials include no less than five years of experience in a position of responsibility administering an archival program. The program must consist of at least one year's study which includes equal emphasis on instruction in archival theory, laboratory work and the opportunity for specialized projects through independent study. The credit hours should total not less than those required by the university for a minor or concentration in a graduate degree program.

II. THEORY ELEMENTS

Courses in archival theory must cover the following five elements taught sequentially or concurrently.

A. The nature of archives, defined as:

- Origin and development of archival principles and methodology
- Terminology
- Archives legislation
- Administrative history
- Problems of forgery, authentication and valuation
- Professional organizations
- Relationship with other professions

B. The acquisition of archives, defined as:

- Acquisition policies, programs, and competition
- Solicitation strategy and techniques

- Legal instruments and their negotiation
- Evaluation for tax purposes
- Records management and the life cycle concept
- Scheduling
- Appraisal principles and methods
- Acquisition options, including sampling and microfilming
- Disposal and disposition, standards and alternatives

C. The processing of archives, defined as:

- Accessioning
- Arrangement
- Description, including such finding aids as guides, inventories, calendars, catalogues, and indexes
- Conservation of textual and non-textual materials, including control of the physical environment
- Storage, including design of buildings, shelving, and archival containers
- Workflow design

D. The use of archives, defined as:

- Reference services
- Access
- Archival security
- Research techniques
- Public relations

E. The administration of archival repositories, defined as:

- Establishing goals and priorities
- Program planning and evaluation
- Budgeting and financial planning
- Appropriations, fund-raising, grant acquisition
- Internal resource allocation
- Staffing and personnel management.

III. LABORATORY ELEMENTS

A. Structure and content.

The laboratory should provide the student with practical experience in all facets of a full-service archival program, including acquisitions, arrangement, description, and reference service. In addition, it may provide opportunities for a degree of specializa-

tion that may not be possible in the sequence of archival theory courses. The laboratory must be project-oriented; that is, the student will be expected to complete a number of specific projects, e.g., the arrangement and description of a collection, the inventory and analysis of a body of current records, the preparation of an appraisal evaluation, or the preparation and conduct of a recorded interview. The laboratory should provide opportunities for field collection, for work with audiovisual or other physical types, and for an introduction to simple preservation and conservation techniques.

B. Duration.

The laboratory experience must include a minimum of 140 hours of project work.

IV. INDEPENDENT STUDY

In addition to theory and laboratory courses, an opportunity for independent study must be available. The assignment should provide for specialized archival experience and should be mutually agreeable to the instructor, the cooperating archival institution, and the student.

D. AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE: Statement of Educational Outcomes

The following is an informal statement from the ASIS representative, based solely on discussions held by the Education and Professionalism Committees within the ASIS organization. A formal statement of educational outcomes is under development by the Professionalism Committee.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Professionals within ASIS can hold positions ranging from programing, AI development, database management, database design, training and records management to the very traditional library position. In each case it is essential the professional have a good understanding of the nature and sources of information, as well as the most appropirate means of using and manipulating information.

Information Management

- Be able to identify information needs of a defined user group or groups.
- Be able to facilitate access to information.
- Be able to plan services based on appropriateness to the needs of a defined user group.
- Have an understanding of the organization of information and of various types.
- Be able to discriminate between types of information sources their formats and characteristics, whether machine-generated or print.
- Be able to determine appropriate training for access to information.
- Understand basic concepts of query search systems for both text and data.
- Be able to apply appropriate research methods to find sources of information and information retrieval solutions.
- Have a working knowledge of current information systems.
- Have problem-solving and systems analysis skills to apply to information-based problems.
- Understand classification methods and schemes. Be able to appropriately design and/or select classification alternatives.
- Have basic computer literacy.
- Have the ability to learn new systems and methods for appropriate use of a computer.

ASIS has also identified continuing education as a responsibility of the society. Through the Education Committee, appropriate continuing education programs are solicited, developed and offered the membership.

APPENDIX A

STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITATION

1972

Adopted by
The Council of the American Library Association
June 27, 1972;
Effective January 1, 1973

Second printing, April 1981

American Library Association
Committee on Accreditation
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

72

STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITATION
1972

INTRODUCTION

The American Library Association is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and by the U.S. Secretary of Education to serve as the accrediting agency for graduate programs of library education leading to the first professional degree. The Council of the Association has in turn designated the Committee on Accreditation to be the unit responsible for the development and implementation of standards for accreditation. The following document sets forth these Standards.

Throughout this document, wherever the term "librarianship" is used, it is meant to be interpreted in its broadest sense as encompassing the relevant concepts of information science and documentation. Whenever the term "libraries" is used, the current models of media centers, educational resources centers, information, documentation, and referral centers are also assumed. "Library service" is understood to be concerned with recordable knowledge and information in their several forms—their identification, selection, acquisition, preservation, organization, dissemination, communication and interpretation, and with assistance in their use. "Library school" means the professional unit (school, department, division, etc.) organized and maintained by an institution of higher education for the purpose of graduate library education leading to the first professional degree.

THE STANDARDS

The intentions, assumptions, and limitations of the document should be clearly understood. These Standards are limited in their application to the evaluation of graduate programs of library education which lead to the first professional degree. While the Committee on Accreditation is also concerned with the quality of the institution of higher education which maintains such a program, it does not itself examine the total institution. It does require however, as a prerequisite to application by the library school for consideration by the Committee, that the parent institution be accredited by the institutional accrediting agency of its region.

The Committee on Accreditation seeks both to protect the public interest and to provide guidance for library educators. Prospective students wishing to make a wise choice of schools, librarians recruiting professional staff, the general public concerned about the kind of library service it receives and supports—all of these have the right to know whether a given program of library education is of good standing. By identifying those programs meeting recognized standards, the Committee

offers such groups, which collectively represent the public interest, a means of quality control in the professional staffing of libraries.

These Standards describe the essential features of programs of library education which prepare librarians for responsibilities beyond those at the narrowly local level. Within this context, the document seeks to identify the indispensable components of good library education without jeopardizing the schools' right and, indeed, obligation for initiative, experimentation, and individual difference in their programs. The statement of requirements and recommendations emphasizes qualitative rather than quantitative considerations, and thus necessarily describes them in rather general terms. Hence the Standards lend themselves to some variation in interpretation, since proper evaluation of any educational program in these respects (e.g. caliber of faculty, effectiveness of teaching methods) must depend on the judgment of experienced and capable observers.

The present document follows upon the *Standards for Accreditation* adopted by the ALA Council in 1951. In twenty years' application of the 1951 Standards, the Committee on Accreditation gained a great deal of valuable experience. Much of this experience is incorporated in the present document as is also the consensus of the views which the Committee has solicited from educators, students, and practitioners. The many changes that have occurred in library service between 1951 and 1972 are reflected in the present Standards, while conversely, many features of the 1951 document, which have shown that they could stand the test of time, are retained.

Each of the major sections in this document represents an essential component of a graduate program in library education. In each section the statement of the standard itself is preceded by the reasoning upon which the standard rests, and is followed by a list of the kinds of evidence that the library school is expected to present to demonstrate that its program meets the standard. The Committee determines the eligibility of a program for accredited status on the basis of evidence presented by the institution, and of the report of a visiting team. The evidence supplied by the institution in support of the Standards is evaluated against the long-term goals and specific objectives presented by the school in accordance with Standard I. While the Committee, as a part of its evaluation, examines each of the component factors, the final judgment is concerned with the totality of the effort and the environment for learning in which it is carried on. The decision regarding accreditation is approached from an assessment of this totality, rather than from a consideration of isolated particulars.

The aim of the *Standards for Accreditation* is to provide guidance for the present which is sufficiently flexible to allow for future developments. The Standards are indicative but not prescriptive. As with the former

Standards, the meaning and meaningfulness of the present Standards must lie in their application. Discrimination because of age, race, color, creed, religion, physical disability, or sex in recruitment, admissions, or financial aid, or in appointment, promotion or pay of faculty and support staff, shall be a violation of these Standards.

I. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: Clearly defined goals and specific objectives for the educational program are an essential frame of reference for meaningful internal and external evaluation. A program is judged on the degree to which it attains its objectives.

STANDARD: The library school should have clearly defined, publicly stated goals. It should also define explicit objectives for its specific educational programs, stated in terms of the educational result to be achieved.

Program goals should reflect:

(1) Consistency with the general principles of librarianship and library education as these are identified by common agreement through the major documents and policy statements of relevant professional organizations.

(2) Responsiveness to the needs of the constituency which the school seeks to serve.

(3) Sensitivity to emerging concepts of the role of the librarian in the library and the library in a multicultural society.

(4) Awareness of the contributions of other disciplines to librarianship.

If the school offers more than one program leading to the first professional degree, the scope and nature of each should be clearly defined. Each program should qualify the graduates to contribute to the advancement of the profession, rather than to serve only the purposes of one institution or locality.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Published announcements of the school's goals and objectives, and program descriptions in school catalogs, bulletins, brochures, etc.
2. Copies of program proposals and program justifications submitted to university committees, administrative officials, and funding agencies.
3. Statements obtained by the visiting team from the administrative officials of the institution, and the executive officer, faculty, students, and alumni of the school.

II. CURRICULUM

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: The distinctive quality of a school is reflected in the nature of the experiences it consciously provides to assist the formal learning process. Professional responsibilities require special background and education by which the librarian is prepared to identify needs, set goals, analyze problems, and formulate original and creative solutions for them; and to participate in planning, organizing, communicating, and administering successful programs of services for users of the library's materials and services.* Professional library education at the graduate level is designed to provide that kind of educational experience.

STANDARD: The programs of the school should provide for the study of principles and procedures common to all types of libraries and library services. A study of specialized service in either general or special libraries may occupy a place in the basic program. Specialization should be built upon a foundation of general academic and professional education and should include interdisciplinary work pertinent to the program of the individual student. A library school offering a single specialization may satisfy the *Standards for Accreditation*, if, in addition to its special curricular emphasis, it provides for the study of general professional principles and procedures prescribed by this standard.

The curriculum comprising the students' total learning experience should be based upon the school's statement of goals and should provide both adequate means and sufficient time for meeting the specific objectives of the programs.

The curriculum should be a unified whole rather than an aggregate of courses. It should (1) stress understanding rather than rote learning of facts; principles and skills rather than routines; (2) emphasize the significance and functions of the subjects taught; (3) reflect the findings of basic and applied research in librarianship and related disciplines; (4) respond to current trends in library development and professional education; (5) promote continuous professional growth.

A curriculum may be composed of a variety of educational experiences derived from the program objectives of the library school. Any such experience should take place within a learning environment in which (1) students have the benefit of guidance by a qualified member of the faculty; (2) adequate supportive materials and facilities are readily available; (3) provision is made for discussion or evaluation of the student's experience.

The curriculum should be continually under review and revision, and should be receptive to innovation. Means should be provided for the

**Library Education and Personnel Utilization: A Statement of Policy Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, June 30, 1970.*

expression of views of students and practitioners in revision of the curriculum.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Bulletin or catalog of the library school, and current course schedules.
2. Degree and program descriptions and justifications developed for administrative use.
3. Syllabi of courses, or descriptions of activities and outcomes for groups of courses arranged by major fields in the school's curriculum.
4. Minutes and reports of the school's curriculum committee.
5. Course evaluations from students.
6. Student papers or other evidence of class projects and independent study.
7. Records of achievement of graduates of the program.
8. Statements obtained by the visiting team from the executive officer, faculty, students, and alumni of the school, and employers of graduates.

III. FACULTY

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: The success of the instructional and research programs of the school is dependent upon the ability of its faculty to teach, stimulate independent thinking, and provide stability and continuity. The size and caliber of the faculty reflect the nature of the school's goals for library education and the values placed upon the student-teacher relationship in the learning process. Research enriches both teaching and learning and provides means for adding to a body of professional knowledge. Professional experience and participation in professional organizations enable faculty members to contribute to the solutions of problems in librarianship and to keep abreast of the concerns of the field.

STANDARD: The school should have a corps of full-time faculty members, in accordance with the institution's approved policies and procedures on affirmative action, academically qualified for appointment to the graduate faculty within the institution and sufficient in number to carry out the major share of the teaching and research requirements of the programs offered. When appropriate, part-time faculty members may be appointed to complement the teaching competencies of the full-time faculty members.

The faculty as a group should evidence (1) a diversity of backgrounds; (2) a substantial and pertinent body of library experience;

(3) advanced degrees from a variety of academic institutions; (4) specialized knowledge covering the subjects in the school's curriculum; (5) a record of sustained productive scholarship; (6) aptitude for educational planning, administration, and evaluation; (7) close and continuing liaison with the field. The qualifications of each faculty member should include interest, ability, and effectiveness in teaching; aptitude for research; competency in the assigned areas of specialization; and active participation in appropriate professional, scientific, and scholarly organizations.

The school should demonstrate the high priority it attaches to good teaching by its appointments and promotions, by its receptivity to innovation in methodology and educational technology, by its provision of a suitable learning environment, and by its solicitation of student reactions to faculty performance.

Allocation and distribution of faculty work loads should result in assignments related to the interests and competencies of individual faculty members and should ensure that the quality of instruction is maintained at the same level throughout all sessions of the calendar year. Work loads should be distributed in such a way as to take into account the time needed by the faculty to engage in student counseling and institutional and professional activities in addition to teaching and research.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Faculty personal data forms.
2. Chart of major curriculum areas with an indication of the faculty members responsible for teaching and research in each of the areas.
3. Faculty work load reports to ascertain student-teacher ratio and class size, courses taught in the last two years, student counseling, research and administrative responsibilities.
4. Observation of instruction.
5. Syllabi, reading lists, and other instructional materials.
6. Examples of student work, including research projects directed by faculty.
7. Examples of faculty research and publication (e.g. theses and dissertations), articles and reports in professional journals, published monographs, work in progress, and research conducted for various groups.
8. For teaching effectiveness and course quality, statements and documents obtained by the visiting team from the administrative officials of the institution, and the executive officer, faculty, students, and alumni of the school.

IV. STUDENTS

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: The character and worth of any graduate program is directly related to the quality of its students.

STANDARD: To fulfill one of the school's major responsibilities to prospective students and the public at large, announcements of program goals and objectives, descriptions of curricula, and identification of faculty should be complete, accurate, and current.

The library school should formulate recruitment, admission, and financial aid policies that will ensure the realization of the goals and objectives of the school's program, that meet or exceed the minimum standards of the parent institution for its graduate programs, and that are responsive to the expressed needs of the profession. Within the framework of institutional policy and of institutional programs designed to assure compliance with legal regulation (e.g. affirmative action programs), the school's admission policy should ensure that applicants declare their commitment to library service supported by evidence of aptitude and personal qualifications. The school should be able to demonstrate that its admission procedures support the admission policy. All criteria used in evaluating applications should be made known to applicants.

Admission should normally be limited to holders of the bachelor's degree representing a broad academic education from an accredited institution, comprising general background which may include major concentrations. The normal academic prerequisites may be waived in favor of applicants of unusual ability or background, where grounds for waiver can be demonstrated. The applicant's academic achievement should be equivalent to that required for entrance into the graduate programs of recognized universities. The standards of admission to the degree program should be applied consistently throughout the year; admission to special programs or courses should not imply automatic admission to degree programs unless the admission standards for special programs and courses are identical to those for degree programs.

Assessment of an application should be based upon a combined evaluation of academic, personal, and intellectual qualifications, recognizing qualifications suitable to the individual's career objectives and appropriate to the school's program.

The school should provide an environment which recognizes students as a responsible segment of the academic community. Within this environment students should be provided with regular assessments of their performance and progress. Opportunities for guidance and counseling should be available to all students.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Statements of admission policy and requirements.
2. Files on applicants admitted and rejected during the past two years.
3. Student transcripts and the school's analyses of them leading to the decision to admit or reject.
4. Letters of reference, notes on personal interviews, and other documents relevant to an assessment of the applicant's personal qualifications.
5. List of enrolled students who do not meet officially stated requirements and explanation of reasons for their acceptance.
6. Recommendations of the school's advisory bodies.
7. Faculty evaluations of student performance and statements of the bases upon which these are prepared.
8. Statements obtained by the visiting team from the administrative officials of the institution; the executive officer, faculty, students, and alumni of the school; and employers of graduates.

V. GOVERNANCE, ADMINISTRATION, AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT

A. Governance

(i.e. administrative relationship of the library school to the parent institution)

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: Librarianship is a profession comprising a distinctive body of knowledge, skills, issues, and challenges. A library school thus requires a high degree of autonomy within an institution of higher education. The school's financial support, staff, physical accommodations, ability to recruit students and attain the objectives of its program are dependent upon its status within the parent institution.

STANDARD: The library school should be an integral but distinctive academic unit within the institution, and its autonomy should be sufficient to assure that the content of its program, the selection and promotion of its faculty, and the selection of its students are controlled by the school within the general guidelines of the institution.

The school's executive officer should have the same title, status, and authority as the heads of comparable units in the institution. The executive officer's salary should be in keeping with this position. The school's faculty and student body should have the same representation as those of comparable units on central committees or councils that are advisory or policy making for the institution.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Organization chart of the institution showing the relationship of the library school and its executive officer to the central administration.
2. Information to be supplied by the administrative officials of the institution and the executive officer of the school regarding the organization of the institution, salary structure for executive officers and faculty, policies and procedures governing faculty promotions and tenure, and involvement of faculty and students in institutional affairs.
3. Statements obtained by the visiting team from the faculty and students of the school.
4. Minutes of faculty meetings.

B. Administration

(i.e. the organization and management of affairs within the school)

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: The effective administration of the library school requires strong leadership on the part of the executive officer who bears the principal decision-making responsibility in the school; however, decisions will be more sound and more effective if they have been reached through consultation and deliberation with those most affected by them. In addition, administrative efficiency depends heavily upon the adequacy of the support staff.

STANDARD: The executive officer should have the administrative ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the office, as well as qualifications comparable to those required of the faculty.

Leadership of the educational program should be characterized by an understanding of the academic environment and application of executive and administrative skills.

The executive officer should be charged with the decision-making aspect of administration. In carrying out this decision-making responsibility, the executive officer should encourage the active participation of the faculty, staff, and students.

In addition, the noninstructional staff should be adequate in number and competence to support the executive officer and faculty in the performance of their duties, and should be appointed in conformity with the institution's approved policies and procedures on affirmative action.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Written communications from the executive officer to faculty and students and to superiors (e.g. annual report, long-range plans).

2. Faculty minutes and minutes and reports of the school's committees, including the membership roster of those committees for the past two years.
3. Organization chart of the school.
4. Written reports and documents such as faculty and student manuals, publications of the student organizations, and reports to alumni.
5. Statements obtained by the visiting team from the administrative officials of the institution, and the executive officer, faculty, students, and noninstructional staff of the school.

C. Financial Support

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: The program of professional education in librarianship is a graduate program. The cost per student for such professional education is far greater than the cost of providing education at the undergraduate level. Support of a graduate program in librarianship entails substantially higher costs for every component.

STANDARD: The institution should provide continuing financial support sufficient to develop and maintain professional library education in accordance with the general principles set forth in these Standards. Support should be related to the size of the faculty required to carry out the school's program of education and research, the financial status and salary schedule of the institution, and necessary instructional facilities and equipment.

The salary schedule for the library school's faculty and executive officer should be comparable to that of other schools within the institution. Salaries within the library school should be equitably established according to the education, experience, responsibilities, and competencies of faculty members.

Funds for research projects, faculty travel, and leaves with pay (e.g. sabbatical leaves) should be available on the same basis as in comparable units of the institution.

Student financial aid from the parent institution should be available on a comparable basis with that of other departments and schools.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Official financial records maintained by the school for the current year as well as those for previous years.
2. Budget and other institutional records that demonstrate the institution's financial commitment to the library school and other comparable units.
3. Report of norms for university salaries related to rank, compared with salaries of library school faculty.

4. Statements obtained from administrative officials of the institution, and the executive officer, faculty, and students of the school.

VI. PHYSICAL RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

RATIONALE FOR STANDARD: The provision of appropriate resources, services, and facilities is necessary to realize maximum effectiveness of teaching and learning.

STANDARD: Instructional resources, services, and facilities should be provided and organized to meet the needs of the specific programs. The general and special collections, staff, and services of the institutional library should be adequate to meet the general educational purposes and needs of the library school. The collection of materials in the field of library science should be adequate in scope, size, content, and availability to support the goals and objectives of the school.

Facilities should be adequate in number, size, and arrangement to carry out the functions and instructional experiences implied in the preceding standards. Faculty and administrative offices, conference and seminar rooms, laboratory space, and facilities unique to the library school programs should be provided.

The library school should have—or have access to, with demonstration capability appropriate to its program objectives—an adequate collection of multimedia resources, computer services, media production laboratories or agencies, and facilities for independent study using up-to-date technology and equipment.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:

1. Annual reports of the institution's libraries.
2. Floor plan of quarters of the library school.
3. List of special equipment and furnishings.
4. Description of additional resources pertinent to the program.
5. Results of the visiting team's inspection of physical resources and facilities.
6. Statements obtained by the visiting team from the executive officer, faculty, students, and library staff.

The Committee on Accreditation maintains a list of accredited programs and publishes a current revision twice a year. A *Manual of Procedures for Evaluation Visits*, prepared by the Committee is distributed to all library schools seeking to work toward accreditation, and upon request to others interested in the accreditation process. Also available upon request is the statement, *Library Education and Personnel Utilization: A Statement of Policy Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, June 30, 1970, to which the reader is referred for further* background on the underlying policy of the Association in the field of education for librarianship.

ISBN 8389-6162-2

APPENDIX B

ACCREDITED STATUS OF LIBRARY SCHOOLS

1925 - March 1986

Dates of Accreditation[1]

I	II	III	IV	V
Library School	Under 1925 Minimum Standards for Library Schools (Date of full Accreditation)[2]	Under 1933 Minimum Requirements for Library Schools[3]	Under 1951 Standards for Accreditation[4,5] (Rescinded effective June 30, 1976)	Under 1972 Standards for Accreditation[5,6]
Alabama				July 1974
Alabama A & M				July 1975[10] to February 2, 1981[11]
Alberta			June 1970 to June 30, 1976[11]	January 1979[5]
Arizona				January 1974
Atlanta		Type II, 1943	June 1954	July 1975
Ball State (Discontinued August 1985)				January 1980 to August 1985
Brigham Young			January 1970	July 1976
British Columbia			January 1963	July 1976
California, Berkeley	1926	Type I, 1934	July 1955	January 1976
California, Los Angeles			June 1962	June 1975
Carnegie (Discontinued 1962)	1926	Type II, 1934	February 1954 to June 1962	
Carnegie Library of Atlanta (Transferred to Emory Univ. 1930)	1926-1930			

I	II	III	IV	V
Case Western Reserve	1926	Type II, 1934	June 1956	January 1976
Catholic		Type II, 1948 (prov. acc. 1941-1948)	June 1957	July 1975
Chicago		Type I, 1934	January 1957	July 1975
Clarion				January 1976
Columbia (See also New York Public Library and New York State)	1927	Type I, 1934	June 1957	January 1976
Dalhousie			January 1973[7]	July 1976
Denver (Discontinued August 1985)		Type III, 1934	June 1957	July 1974 to August 1985
Drexel	1926	Type II, 1934	February 1954	July 1975
Emory (See also Carnegie Library of Atlanta)	1930	Type II, 1934	June 1954	January 1975
Emporia Kansas State	1932	Type III, 1934 to August 1956	July 1966	July 1976 to July 13, 1982[11] July 1985[5]
Florida State			April 1953	January 1976
Hampton (Discontinued 1939)	1928	Type II, 1934-1939		
Hawaii			June 1967	July 1974
Illinois	1926	Type I, 1934	January 1955	January 1975
Indiana			April 1953	July 1976

I	II	III	IV	V
Iowa			June 1971	July 1974
Kent State			July 1963	July 1976
Kentucky		Type III, 1942	June 1955	January 1976
Long Island			January 1971	January 1976
Los Angeles Public Library (Discontinued 1932)	1926-1932			
Louisiana State		Type II, 1934	January 1955	January 1974
McGill	1929	Type II, 1934	January 1957	January 1975
Maryland			June 1967	July 1976
Marywood		Type III, 1946 to July 1954		
Michigan	1928	Type I, 1934	February 1954	January 1975
Minnesota (Discontinued June 1985)		Type III, 1935	June 1956	July 1975 to June 1985
Mississippi (Discontinued December 1984)				February 1981[12] to December 1984
Missouri, Columbia			June 1969	July 1976
Montreal			June 1969	July 1976
New Jersey (Discontinued 1952)	1929	Type III, 1934-1952		
New York at Albany	1932	Type III, 1934 to August 1957	January 1966	January 1975

I	II	III	IV	V
New York at Buffalo			June 1972	January 1976
New York at Geneseo (Discontinued August 1983)		Type III, 1946 to August 1957	June 1968	July 1975 to August 1983
New York Public Library (Consolidated with New York State Library School & transferred to Columbia Univ. 1926)	1926 (See Column I)			
New York State (Consolidated with New York Public Library & transferred to Columbia Univ. 1926)	1926 (See Column I)			
North Carolina at Chapel Hill		Type II, 1934 Type III, 1934-1941	June 1957	July 1976
North Carolina College for Women (Greensboro; discontinued 1933)	1931-1933			
North Carolina at Greensboro (See also North Carolina College for Women)				January 1982
North Carolina Central				July 1975
North Texas State			January 1967	July 1976
Northern Illinois			January 1970[8]	July 1975
Oklahoma	1932	Type III, 1934	June 1956 to June 30, 1976[11]	January 1979[5]
Oregon (Discontinued August 1978)			June 1968	January 1976-August 1978

I	II	III	IV	V
Our Lady of the Lake		Type II, 1943 to August 1955		
Peabody (Merged with Vanderbilt Univ. 1979)	1932	Type II, 1934	July 1955	January 1976
Pittsburgh			January 1964	January 1976
Pratt	1926	Type III, 1934-1940 Type II, 1940	January 1957	July 1976
Queens			June 1970	January 1976
Rhode Island			June 1971 to June 30, 1976[11]	January 1979[5] to January 1986[11]
Rosary		Type III, 1938 to August 1955	June 1962	July 1975
Rutgers			January 1956	July 1974
St. Catherine	1931	Type III, 1934 to August 1957		
St. John's				January 1976
St. Louis (Discontinued 1932)	1926-1932			
San Jose State			June 1969 to June 30, 1976[11]	January 1979[5]
Simmons	1926	Type II and Type III, 1934	January 1955	January 1976
South Carolina				July 1974
South Florida				July 1975

I	II	III	IV	V
Southern California		Type II, 1938	June 1956	July 1976
Southern Connecticut			June 1972	July 1976
Southern Mississippi				July 1980
Syracuse	1930	Type II, 1934	January 1957	January 1976
Tennessee				January 1974
Texas at Austin			April 1953	January 1976
Texas Woman's		Type III, 1938	January 1957	July 1976
Toronto		Type II, 1937[9]	June 1956	January 1975
Vanderbilt (see Peabody)				January 1976
Washington	1926	Type II, 1934	January 1957	January 1976
Wayne State			June 1967	July 1976 to July 9, 1985[11]
Western Michigan		Type III, 1948 to August 1957	June 1959	July 1975 to June 28, 1983[11]
Western Ontario			January 1969	January 1976
William and Mary (Discontinued 1948)		Type III, 1938-1948		
Wisconsin-Madison	1926	Type III, 1934-1941 Type II, 1941	February 1956	July 1975
Wisconsin-Milwaukee				July 1976

FOOTNOTES

[1] Where no terminal date is shown in a column, accreditation under existing standards was carried forward until accreditation under the next set of standards was granted.

[2] From 1925 to 1933 library schools were evaluated under Minimum Standards for Library Schools adopted by the ALA Council, July 7, 1925 (Bulletin of the American Library Association 19: 238-246, July 1925). Inquiries regarding classification and provisional accreditation of schools under the 1925 Standards should be directed to ALA Committee on Accreditation, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

[3] From 1933 to 1948 library schools were evaluated under Minimum Requirements for Library Schools adopted by the ALA Council, October 21, 1933 (Bulletin of the American Library Association 27:610-613, December 15, 1933). Admission to the first professional curriculum offered by Type I and Type II library schools required a bachelor's degree. Type III library schools included the first professional curriculum within the four undergraduate college years. Pending the adoption of new standards, the Board of Education for Librarianship suspended accrediting procedures in August 1948, but continued the status and classification of the accredited library schools until they could be evaluated under the new standards.

[4] From 1951 to June 30, 1972 graduate library school programs were evaluated under Standards for Accreditation adopted by the ALA Council, July 13, 1951 (ALA Bulletin 46: 48-49, February 1952).

[5] Under COA policy, accredited status is retroactive to cover the academic year preceding the one in which the accreditation visit was made. For example, programs accredited in January or June 1975 would have been visited during the academic year 1974-75 and would be accorded accredited status for the academic year 1973-74 and following.

[6] Since 1973, graduate library education programs leading to the first professional degree are accredited under Standards for Accreditation adopted by the ALA Council, June 27, 1972. (Single copies available on request from the ALA Committee on Accreditation, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.)

[7] During the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 1973 the following program was accredited by the American Library Association under the 1951 Standards for Accreditation: Dalhousie University, Master of Library Service (Accredited status retroactive to cover academic year 1970-71).

[8] Accredited status retroactive to cover academic year 1967-68.

[9] BLS curriculum, not diploma course, accredited.

[10] Accredited as a single specialization program in school library media.

[11] Under COA policy, when accreditation is withdrawn from a program, any student enrolled in the program who completes the degree requirements within eighteen months after the date of withdrawal will be considered as having been graduated from an ALA-accredited program.

[12] Accredited status retroactive to cover summer term 1979 since this period falls in the University 1979-80 academic year.

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, "Criteria for Accrediting Programs in Engineering in the United States." 51st Annual Report for year ending September 30, 1983. New York: ABET, 1983.

Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation in Journalism and Mass Communications Educational Programs. 1980.

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. Accreditation Standards and Guidelines for Business Administration Programs. 1984.

American Bar Association. Approval of Law Schools; American Bar Association Standards and Rules and Procedures, as amended, 1983.

American Library Association. The ALA Accreditation Process, 1973-1976: A Survey of Library Schools Whose Programs were Evaluated under the 1972 Standards. ALA, 1977 (out of print).

_____. Accreditation Appeals Process Guidelines. ALA. October 1975, revised October 1985.

_____. Library Education and Personnel Utilization: A Statement of Policy Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, June 30, 1970.

_____. Committee on Accreditation. Accreditation Practices and Procedures. ALA/COA. August 1977.

_____. _____. Accreditation of Programs of Education for Librarianship. ALA/COA, May 1983, revised October 1985.

_____. _____. Accredited Status of Library Schools, 1925 to date. ALA/COA, Current.

_____. _____. Bachelor's Degree in Library Science. ALA/COA. February 1961.

_____. _____. Graduate Library Education Programs Accredited by the American Library Association under Standards for Accreditation, 1972. ALA/COA, Current.

_____. _____. Guideline Statements:
Accreditation and the Curriculum. November 1975.
Accreditation and the Employment Situation. October 1976
Conditional Accreditation. January 1985
Extension/Off-Campus Program Offerings. June 1977.
Goals and Objectives. April 1982.
A Library School's Program as a Unified Whole. May 1977.
Non-discrimination, Affirmative Action and Accreditation. July 1981
Principles and Procedures Common to All Types of Libraries. June 1981.
Single Specialization in Library Education. June 1981.
Sustained Productive Scholarship. June 1981.

_____. _____. Manual of Procedures for Accreditation Visits under Standards for Accreditation, 1972. ALA/COA, revised 1981.

_____. _____. Organization and Functions. ALA/COA, July 1978, revised October 1985.

_____. _____. Role of the Canadian Library Association Observer. ALA/COA. May 1973, revised August 1984.

_____. _____. Self-Study: A Guide to the Process and to the Preparation of a Report for the Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association (under the Standards for Accreditation, 1972). ALA/COA, revised 1981.

_____. _____. Standards for Accreditation, 1972 2nd printing, 1981.

Asheim, Lester Ed. The Core of Education for Librarianship. Chicago: ALA, 1954.

Beasley, Kenneth E. "Issues in Library Accreditation." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 67-81. (Pages 70-73 have a good short situation report on COA and its present procedures. The rest is background for standards.)

Berry, John. "Editorial: Strengthening Accreditation." Library Journal 107:5 (March 1, 1982): 489.

"Bibliography on Accreditation." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 162.

Bidlack, Russell E. "Evaluating the Accreditation Committee." American Libraries 8 (September 1977): 442-443.

Consoli, John. "Overhaul is Planned by Accrediting Council." Editor & Publisher 116 (April 2, 1983): 10.

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. The Balance Wheel for Accreditation. July 1984.

_____. Interpretive Guidelines for Recognition Provisions. Washington, DC: COPA, April 15, 1981.

_____. Policy Statement on the Role and Value of Accreditation. COPA. April 15, 1982.

_____. Policy Statement on Considerations When Closing a Postsecondary Educational Institution. COPA. April 15, 1982.

_____. Provisions and Procedures for Becoming Recognized as an Accrediting Agency for Postsecondary Educational Institutions or Programs. Washington, DC: COPA, May 15, 1982.

Council on Social Work, Commission on Accreditation. Handbook for Accreditation Standards and Procedures, revised July 1984. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1984.

Daniel, Evelyn H. "Accreditation." Library Journal 110:6 (April 1, 1985): 49-53.

_____. "Expanding ALA Accreditation." Library Journal 108:3 (February 1, 1983): 178-179.

Eshelman, William R. "The Erosion of Library Education." Library Journal 108:13 (July 1983): 1309-1311.

Evans, G. Edward "Teaching New Technologies: Whose Role Is It?", presented at IFLA General Conference, Munich, 1983.

Fauser, John J. "The Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA)." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 101-104.

Geist, Chrisann F. "The Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE)." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 105-108.

Grogan, D. J. "Education for Librarianship." Education for Information 1(1983): 3-23.

Holley, Edward G. and Muriel Howick. "The Accreditation Process: What the Task Force Learned." Journal of Education for Librarianship: 18 (Fall 1977): 83-92.

Horrocks, Norman. "Sharing Accreditation." Library Journal 109:20 (December 1984): 2238-2241.

"Issues and Organizational Concerns about Accreditation: A Panel Discussion." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 120-127. (Includes "Association of Records Managers and Administrators" by J. Michael Pemberton, "Special Libraries Association" by M. Hope Coffman, "American Society for Information Science" by Charles H. Davis, and "Society of American Archivists" by Trudy H. Peterson.)

Medical Library Association. Information Statement on the Certification Examination for Health Science Librarians.

Millard, Richard M. "The Accrediting Association: Ensuring the Quality of Programs and Institutions." Change 15:4 (May/June 1983): 32-36.

_____. "Accreditation," Chapter 1 in Meeting the New Demand for Standards, (New Directions for Higher Education #43), J.R. Warren, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September 1983.

_____. "The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation: Background, Structure, and Functions." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 83-86.

_____. "The Structure of Specialized Accreditation in the United States." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 87-100.

Miller, F.W. "Measuring the Value of Volunteer Efforts." Association Management 34 (November 1982): 77-79.

National Architectural Accrediting Board. NAAB Criteria and Procedures. NAAB, 1983.

National Association of Private Non-traditional Schools and Colleges. Accreditation Fact Sheet. Eric Document #ED2086697, Grand Junction, Colorado: September 1981.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. NCATE, 1975.

National League for Nursing. Criteria for the Evaluation of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs in Nursing. 5th Ed., 1983.

Peterson, Dorothy G. Accrediting Standards and Guidelines. Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1980.

"SESSION IV: The Working Committees (of the September 1984 Accreditation Conference)." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 128-139.

"Statement of Concern about Accreditation Issues from the Various Professional Organizations." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 155-161.

Task Force on Accreditation Issues. "The Accreditation Process. A Position Paper Submitted to the Board of Directors of the Association of American Library Schools, October 1978." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 149-152.

UNESCO. International Symposium on Harmonization of Education and Training Programmes in Information Science, Librarianship and Archival Studies. Paris: UNESCO, 1984.

U. S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agencies and Associations. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation, February 1984.

Veaner, Allen. "The Anatomy of Accreditation." Adapted from an article originally prepared for The Library Bulletin of the Stanford University Libraries. ALA/COA.

Young, Kenneth E., Charles M. Chambers, and H.R. Kells. Understanding Accreditation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Yungmeyer, Elinor. "The ALA Accreditation Program." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 25:2 (Fall 1984): 109-119. (Pages 112-117 provide detail on the COA and its present procedures.)

_____. "The Role of Professional Associations in Achieving Excellence." Journal of Education for Librarianship. 23:4 (Spring 1983): 264-272.

APPENDIX D

PARTICIPATING ASSOCIATIONS

AALL American Association of Law Libraries
William Jepson, Executive Director
(AALL withdrew from the Project 7/85)

ALA American Library Association
Dr. Thomas Galvin, Executive Director

ASIS American Society for Information Science
Linda Resnik, Executive Director

ALISE Association for Library and Information Science Education
Janet C. Phillips, Executive Secretary

ARL Association of Research Libraries
Shirley T. Echelman, Executive Director

CLA Canadian Library Association

MLA Medical Library Association
Raymond Palmer, Executive Director

SLA Special Libraries Association
Dr. David R. Bender, Executive Director

ARMA Association of Records Managers and Administrators
Louis G. Snyder, Executive Director
(ARMA withdrew from the Project 6/85)

NFAIS National Federation of Abstracting and Information Services
Betty Unruh, Executive Director
(NFAIS withdrew from the project 1/86)

SAA Society of American Archivists
Ann Morgan Campbell, Executive Director

STEERING COMMITTEE

CHAIR:

ALA Dr. Robert M. Hayes, Dean
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of California, Los Angeles

MEMBERS:

AALL Margaret A. Leary, Law Librarian
University of Michigan Law Library
(AALL withdrew from the Project 7/85)

ALA Tom G. Watson
Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor and the Provost
University of the South

ASIS Dr. Trudi Bellardo
College of Library and Information Science
University of Kentucky

ALISE Dr. F. William Summers, Dean
College of Library and Information Studies
Florida State University

ARL Dr. James F. Govan
University Librarian
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

CLA Beth Miller
School of Library and Information Science
University of Western Ontario

MLA Raymond A Palmer, Executive Director
Medical Library Association

SLA Vivian J. Arterbery
Rand Corporation Library

ARMA Dr. J. Michael Pemberton
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of Tennessee - Knoxville
(ARMA withdrew from the Project 6/85)

NFAIS Dr. Tefko Saracevic
Matthew A. Baxter School of information and Library Science
Case Western Reserve University
(NFAIS withdrew from the project 1/86)

SAA Ann Morgan Campbell, Executive Director
Society of American Archivists

Alternate: Dr. Trudy H. Peterson
National Archives

WORKING GROUP 1:
ORGANIZATION OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

CHAIR:

ASIS Dr. Richard I. Blue
School of Library and Information Science
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

MEMBERS:

ALA Dr. Dennis D. Goetsch
College of Veterinary Medicine
University of Georgia

ALA William R. Eshelman, President
Scarecrow Press, Inc.

ALISE Dr. Timothy W. Sineath, Dean
College of Library and Information Science
University of Kentucky

ARL Dr. Irene B. Hoadley, Director of Libraries
Texas A & M University

CLA Professor Lois M. Bewley
School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
University of British Columbia

MLA Gloria Werner
University Library
University of California, Los Angeles

SLA Dr. Marcy Murphy
School of Library and Information Science
Indiana University

STEERING COMMITTEE LIAISONS:

ARL Dr. James F. Govan
University Librarian
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MLA Raymond A Palmer, Executive Director
Medical Library Association

WORKING GROUP 2:
FINANCE OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

CHAIR:

ARL Dr. Peter Spyers-Duran, Director
Wayne State University Libraries

MEMBERS:

AALL Randall Peterson
John Marshall Law School Library
(Appointed 6/85)
(AALL withdrew from the Project 7/85)

ALA Michael Madden, Director
Schaumburg Township Public Library

ALA Allen B. Veaner
Allen B. Veaner Associates

ASIS Dr. Kieth H. Stirling
Harold B. Lee Library
Brigham Young University

ALISE Dr. Ann E. Prentice, Director
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

CLA Vivienne I. F. Monty
Government and Business Library
York University

MLA Yvonne Wulff
A. Taubman Medical Library
University of Michigan

SLA Muriel B. Regan
Gossage Regan Associates, Inc.

STEERING COMMITTEE LIAISONS:

ALA Tom G. Watson
Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor and the Provost
University of the South

ALISE Dr. F. William Summers, Dean
College of Library and Information Science
University of South Carolina

WORKING GROUP 3:
GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

CHAIR:

ALISE Dr. Charles A. Bunge
School of Library and Information Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison

MEMBERS:

ALA Herbert S. White, Dean
School of Library and Information Science
Indiana University

ALA Dr. Herman L. Totten
School of Library and Information Sciences
North Texas State University

ASIS Dr. Marianne Cooper
Graduate School of Library and Information Studies
Queens College, City University of New York

ARL Dr. Edward G. Holley
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

CLA Richard L. Greene
Bibliotheque des science humaine et sociales
Universite de Montreal

MLA Dr. M. Kent Mayfield
Medical Library Association

SLA Valerie Noble
The Upjohn Company

STEERING COMMITTEE LIAISONS:

ASIS Dr. Trudi Bellardo
College of Library and Information Science
University of Kentucky

NFAIS Dr. Tefko Saracevic
Matthew A. Baxter School of Information and Library Science
Case Western Reserve University
(NFAIS withdrew from the project 1/86)

WORKING GROUP 4:
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY

CHAIR:

CLA Dr. Nancy Williamson
Faculty of Library and Information Science
University of Toronto

MEMBERS:

ALA Dr. Lucille Whalen
School of Information and Library Science
State University of New York at Albany

ALA Dr. Edwin M. Cortez
School of Library and Information Science
Catholic University

ASIS Dr. K. Leon Montgomery
School of Library and Information Science
University of Pittsburgh

ALISE Dr. Robert D. Stueart, Dean
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Simmons College

ARL Dr. Thomas Shaughnessy
Director of Libraries
University of Missouri - Columbia

MLA Dr. Gwendolyn S. Cruzat
School of Library Science
Univesity of Michigan

SLA Professor Miriam H. Tees
Graduate School of Library and Information Studies
McGill University

STEERING COMMITTEE LIAISON:

ALA Dr. Robert M. Hayes, Dean
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of California, Los Angeles

WORKING GROUP 5: GUIDELINES FOR CURRICULUM

CHAIR:

MLA Dr. Fred W. Roper
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEMBERS:

ALA Dr. Bernard S. Schlessinger
School of Library and Information Studies
Texas Woman's University

ALA Dr. Antonio Rodriguez-Buckingham
School of Library Service
University of Southern Mississippi

ASIS Dr. Richard E. D. Koenig
School of Library Service
Columbia University

ALISE Dr. Evelyn H. Daniel, Dean
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

ARL Dr. Sul H. Lee, Dean
University Libraries
University of Oklahoma

CLA Dr. Richard K. Gardner, Directeur
Ecole de bibliotheconomie et des sciences de l'information
Universite de Montreal

SLA Ellen Gerber
Special Libraries Association
(10/84 to 6/85)

Ellen Steininger
Burson-Marsteller
(Appointed 6/85)

SAA Andrew Raymond
Society of American Archivists

STEERING COMMITTEE LIAISONS:

AALL Margaret Leary, Law Librarian
University of Michigan Law Library
(AALL withdrew from the Project 7/85)

SLA Vivian J. Arterbery
Rand Corporation Library

WORKING GROUP 6: GUIDELINES FOR SOCIETY-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

CHAIR:

ASIS Ann-Marie Horcher
Senior Tools Analyst
Dow Corning Corporation

MEMBERS:

AALL Judith M. Wright
University of Chicago Law Library
(Appointed 6/85)
(AALL withdrew from the Project 7/85)

ALA Dr. James M. Matarazzo
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Simmons College

ALA Alice B. Ihrig, Director
Civic and Cultural Programs
Moraine Valley Community College

ALISE Dr. Stephen James
School of Library and Information Studies
Atlanta University

ARL Margot McBurney, Chief Librarian
Douglas Library
Queen's University
(10/84 to 4/85)

Shirley T. Echelman, Executive Director
Association of Research Libraries
(Appointed 6/85)

CLA Jean Orpwood, Director of Libraries
North York Public Library

MLA Trudy A. Gardner
Rush Presbyterian St. Luke Hospital

SLA M. Hope Coffman
Charles S. Draper Lab
Technical Information Center
(10/84 to 7/85)
(Working Group Chair until 6/85)

Mary Lou Stursa
Steenbock Memorial Library
University of Wisconsin - Madison
(Appointed 7/85)

SAA Ann Morgan Campbell, Executive Director
Society of American Archivists

STEERING COMMITTEE LIAISON:

CLA Beth Miller
School of Library and Information Science
University of Western Ontario

PROJECT STAFF

Elinor Yungmeyer
Accreditation Officer
Committee on Accreditation
American Library Association

Kate Shockey
Administrative Secretary to the Project
Committee on Accreditation
American Library Association